

Spearhead

£1.50


No. 410

APRIL 2003

ISSN 1364-7105

WARMONGER TONY

**Why has
Blair been
so fanatical
to follow
President
Bush into
conflict with
Iraq?**



*Sensational disclosures which may provide a clue to
what has been going on behind the scenes (Page 4)*

WHAT WE THINK

War breaks out; insanity reigns

Exactly 21 years ago this very month, the Falklands War began when Argentina invaded the Islands. British forces were quickly sent to the South Atlantic to take the Falklands back. *Spearhead* wholeheartedly supported this decision. British territory had been occupied. British people had been placed under foreign rule. There could be no doubt that military action on the part of Britain was unavoidable and right.

Last month, Britain joined in a US-led military coalition to attack Iraq. No British territory had been invaded. No British people had been subjugated or in any way put under threat. No British interest was at stake. Military action by Britain has therefore been absolutely avoidable and wrong.

These are the very simple issues that should inform our attitude to the war that has now broken out in the Middle East. A nation in its right mind only goes to war when its own territory, people or interests have been

Nationalist comment

attacked or threatened, or those interests are in some other way served. Nations prepared to shed the blood of their armed forces personnel for any other purpose have got to be deemed insane.

And a state of national insanity is the only possible description that can now fit the situation in this country. We have gone mad, stark staring mad – or at least our politicians have gone mad, accompanied by a large section of the opinion media which has been backing the war.

That statement should be qualified. The attack on Iraq is an act of madness from the *national* point of view. This is not to say that those ordering and supporting it are necessarily mad in the personal sense. Overwhelmingly, they are people capable of thinking and acting perfectly rationally in almost any other context. Their madness is compounded of two things: they are victims to the fashionable ideological diseases of liberalism and globalism which, once their basic premises are accepted, lead otherwise sane folk into support of policies that are utterly insane; and – let us face it – they are also people whose personal ambitions and even livelihoods are dependent upon their being prepared to endorse policies which in a different situation they would utterly reject. This category includes many politicians in parliament and probably the majority of journalists in the media. Powerful – very, very powerful – forces have decreed that Saddam Hussein must be destroyed, and the career interests of a great many people dictate that they must go along with this course.

But that is not all. A significant part of the

current national madness has been demonstrated even in the ranks of those who have opposed the war. A great deal of weight has been placed on the question of whether the attack on Iraq should have been launched without United Nations support, and the anti-war lobby has opposed the attack on the grounds that no such support has been forthcoming. In fact, the UN position on the war should be irrelevant. Whether or not the UN supports military action against a country has nothing whatever to do with whether Britain should take it. If the national criteria which we have spelled out justify Britain going to war, we should go to war regardless of the UN. If such criteria do not provide justification, we should not go to war even if the UN Security Council and Assembly vote overwhelmingly in favour of it.

Insanity not new

What has been written above might seem suggestive of a new departure in British foreign policy, but in fact it is far from that. If we look back over the past 100 years, the Falklands conflict notwithstanding, Britain has in fact again and again embroiled herself in conflicts which she could and should have kept out of. As is the case today, great moral outrage against assumed 'enemies' has been stoked up which has conveniently shrouded the basic question of whether true national interests justified war. Again and again, the debate has hung on the question of whether the current international bogeyman is a good guy or a bad guy, whereas it should always have hung on a simple cool and carefully calculated consideration of whether, in strategic terms, our nation stood to gain or lose by joining hostilities.

We see today the same hysteria employed, fuelled by horror stories which surely only the moron constituency can swallow. In a report in the *Daily Mail* on the 21st March we had a foretaste of what to expect. Jane Corben, writing from Amman in Jordan, talked of associates of Saddam, including members of his family, boiling opponents alive, cutting their hands, feet and tongues off, gouging their eyes out and raping female relatives in their presence. Whether Miss Corben or the *Mail* editor really believe this kind of stuff seems immaterial. They are journalists paid to present such stories just as a lawyer is paid to argue the case of a client in court quite regardless of whether he thinks it sound or not. In another piece in the same paper on the very same day, correspondent Philip Knightley quoted an American military officer telling the *Washington Post*: "This is the most information-intensive war you can imagine... We're going to lie about things." Well, that is at least a frank declaration of intent for which we should be grateful. Sir Arthur Ponsonby told us a long

Spearhead

No. 410 APRIL 2003

PO Box 2471, Hove, E. Sussex BN3 4DT

Editor: John Tyndall

Spearhead exists to reflect a cross-section of contemporary British Nationalist opinion. It is privately published by its editor and is independent of all political parties and groups.

Unless it is specifically stated otherwise, the views expressed in signed articles or letters in *Spearhead* are the sole responsibility of their writers and should not be taken as representing the views of the Editor or the policies of any political organisation that *Spearhead* may support editorially.

Spearhead welcomes enquiries from prospective advertisers, to whom rates will be sent on request. Advertising matter, accompanied by pre-payment, must be submitted at least one month prior to the publishing date (normally the first day of the month) of the issue for which the advertisement is intended. The Editor reserves the right to refuse, without giving reasons, to publish any advertisement submitted. The appearance of an advertisement in *Spearhead* does not necessarily indicate that the Editor has any knowledge of, interest in or support for the product, service, organisation or function being advertised.

The Editor is pleased to receive from readers manuscripts for articles for possible publication. The most useful lengths are of around 1,000 to 1,850 words. *Spearhead* is currently produced using Serif PagePlus 6 software. Articles sent on 3.5" computer disk will be welcome if compatible. To ensure acceptance, however, they should also be sent in printed or typewritten format. No payment is made for articles published, which become *Spearhead* copyright unless the writers specifically request otherwise. The Editor reserves the right to shorten or in any other way amend articles submitted for publication.

Those wishing to reprint *Spearhead* articles in other publications should ensure when doing so to give public acknowledgement to both the writer and *Spearhead* and to include in the acknowledgement the magazine's full address.

time ago that when nations go to war the first casualty is truth. However, there is a world of difference between untruth used as a necessary tactical weapon in a war which from the national point of view is just and right – and untruth used to justify a war which from that same national point of view has no justification. The war against Iraq belongs to the latter category, as have other wars in recent history in which Britain has been involved. They have all been part of the pattern of national insanity that has distinguished British policy over a century.

The best serving the worst

One quite puerile argument that has been used by some politicians and journalists is that, now the fighting has started, the nation must put its wholehearted support behind “our boys” and thus suspend all criticism of the war in which they are engaged. This is a quite cynical piece of exploitation of the fine young men (and a few women) who are out there in the battle zone – as well as an exploitation of the public’s natural patriotism in a cause that actually has nothing whatever to do with real patriotism.

One look at pictures of our fighting troops is enough to tell us that they constitute the very best specimens of the British race. It is a tragedy and a crime that their lives are being put on the line (and in a few cases have already been lost) in service to the dubious causes of the politicians who have sent them there. There must be many of us who, as we sit by our TV sets and witness them marching into action, would dearly love to see Tony Blair and his ‘New Labour’ gang up there in front, braving the missiles and the bullets in the conflict they have been so keen to unleash – indeed perhaps performing the first useful piece of work in their lives by being employed in operations of minefield-clearance!

The point is that by attacking the war we are not attacking the troops who have to do the fighting; we are attacking the politicians who put them there for that purpose. This magazine, for one, most certainly is not going to be intimidated into keeping silent over this crazy war by politicians and journalists using our soldiery as shields behind which they hide from deserved criticism.

The war in Iraq is a perfect example of the best fighting for the worst, brave young men and women inspired by the finest ideals of service risking their lives for the pond life at home who act as the lackeys of foreign interests and possess not an ounce of patriotism in their puny bodies.

The reality: war without end

Such is the overwhelming concentration of firepower now being directed at Saddam Hussain’s forces, it is not likely that this war



NEXT STOP DOVER?

This is one of the first batches of Iraqi prisoners to be taken following the outbreak of war, seen here with an American guard. It can safely be predicted that before very long more than a few of them will be finding their way to Britain claiming ‘asylum’. It can equally be predicted that most of them will get it!

will last long. Indeed, it could to all intents and purposes be over, barring a few skirmishes, by the time this issue reaches our readers.

But it will be then that the problems will really start. There will be the immense task of rebuilding Iraq from the rubble that allied shells, bombs and missiles will have created. And who do you think will be paying for all this? You’ve guessed it in one – the British and American taxpayers! We will foot the bill for Tony’s and Dubya’s military adventure. The cost will be absolutely vast – and this will be something quite apart from the cost of the military operations themselves, which have been estimated at £5 billion to Britain but will probably be far higher.

And of course a massive part of this will be the rising cost of oil resulting from the destabilisation of the Middle East in which the build-up to the war, and now the war itself, will have resulted. This will add crippling burdens to the economies, not just of Britain and the US, but of all nations dependent on oil imports.

So much for the economic costs of this war. What of the political costs and the costs in terms of security to all western nations, but particularly Britain and America? By this war we are sowing seeds of hatred in the Arab and Islamic worlds by comparison with which that existing up to now will be small potatoes. The war is being presented as one against terrorism; in fact it is likely to multiply acts of terrorism a hundredfold. The peoples among whom this legacy of hatred will survive are no match for advanced western nations in military technology and sophistication of weapon power, and that is why in a conventional war they stand no chance. But they are peoples out of whom many thousands, possibly millions, will

emerge who have no fear of dying with ‘Allah’ on their lips in order to bring death and destruction to the infidel world by which they see themselves oppressed. Further Twin Towers atrocities, not only in the United States but here in the United Kingdom too, can be regarded as a near-certainty. The ability and willingness to commit such atrocities in our own towns and cities constitutes the power that these races have over us – to counter the power which, in other ways, we have over them.

And not only that, but they have, in our very midst, vast numbers of the very people perfectly capable of unleashing that power to our detriment and destruction. The lunatic immigration policies permitted by Britain and the United States over the past thirty years have created huge alien populations in both countries which include the very fanatics able and willing to carry out the terrorist acts which are the Islamic world’s one available retaliation for what is now happening in Iraq. This, needless to say, compounds the insanity of the present war.

And of one thing we can be quite sure. These populations seething with anti-US and anti-British hatred which we now harbour in our cities will soon be reinforced by large numbers of Iraqis, who it is predicted will be heading for our shores in consequence of the devastation of their country for which they will hold us responsible. Even officialdom itself has acknowledged that more 100,000 will be coming here. We can straightaway double that figure to get a glimpse of what we are in for!

We say it again: from every common-sense British point of view this war against Iraq is sheer insanity. It is a war being waged, not for Britain, but for the New World Order, of which Tony Blair is a grovelling tool.

Is this the reason why Blair has been hell-bent on war?

WHEN looked at from his own point of view, Tony Blair's determination to be President Bush's lackey in the war against Iraq defies all logic.

We don't expect the likes of Blair to care a damn about Britain's best interests. Since when have we had a Prime Minister who did that?

But it might be expected that the Premier would be governed by a thought for what is in *his* best interests as a politician. But seemingly not. Through his war policy, he has been fast alienating his own party, just as he has been alienating large sections of the British public. Just what is the sense of it? Just why has Tony been so fanatical to go to war at Bush's side?

A clue was perhaps provided by a story which came over the internet last month, though it has yet to break in most of the mainstream media. The story came from an independent British journalist, Mike James, based in Frankfurt, Germany. According to James, a high-ranking former member of the Blair Government was at the centre of a paedophile ring containing a number of politicians in a situation not unlike that which caused a big scandal in Belgium some years ago. This particular member, says James, used his influence to persuade the police to grant a firearms licence to Thomas Hamilton, the notorious paedophile later convicted for the massacre of schoolchildren in Dunblane.

The member was named in the James story, though we are not naming him here. However, according to the story another close associate of Blair, of much higher public profile, is also reported to be part of the ring. It is believed that if the story does eventually hit national headlines it will be the end of Blair and his Government.

For while Blair himself may not be directly involved in the ring, he is clearly well aware of it and has in fact used his offices to shield it from public exposure and scrutiny.

The story has indeed been given out on the web-site of Scotland's *Sunday Herald*, and the named paedophile ring member has threatened

to sue the *Herald* over it. In the meantime, the Blair Government has issued a D-notice to gag the press from any further disclosures of the identities of those in the ring, which include several more prominent Labour politicians.

James says that an extraordinary blanket of secrecy followed the Dunblane incident. Large sections of the police report on the incident were banned from the public domain under a 100-year secrecy order, an order very rarely issued except in cases thought to be vital to national security. Following the killings by Hamilton, says James, "parents and teachers were advised to concentrate their efforts on a campaign to out-


law handguns instead of focusing on how the mentally unstable freemason (Hamilton), already known to the police to be a paedophile, had obtained a firearms licence for six handguns."

And here is the real dynamite. United States security agencies, including the FBI and CIA, are in possession of all the information concerning this scandal and cover-up, and the suggestion in the James report is that they could well be using it as a means to twist Blair's arm over going to war against Iraq. As James puts it:-

"When Tony Blair took office following a landslide victory in 1997, few commentators would have suggested that this man would be willing to drag his country into an unjustified war of aggression against a people that have done no harm to the British public. Nor would anyone have surmised that a Labour Government would hitch its political fortunes to a shabby cabal of fanatical neo-conservative Zionists working to make real their much-touted biblical Armageddon. And no one could have predicted that Blair's nominally 'Christian' administration would transform itself into a licentious club of flamboyant homosexual cruisers and out-of-control paedophiles."

It is expected that more about this festering scandal will surface in the coming weeks. In the meantime, keep an eye on the site from which we have obtained this information, which is:-

www.PropagandaMatrix.com



THE PRIME MINISTER WITH BUSH
Do the Americans have something on him that we don't know about?

The things they're saying

The refusal of France and Germany to toe Washington's line has spurred Donald Rumsfeld into launching a war of insults.

But how does it help to accuse France and Germany of being 'ungrateful' to America just because, 60 years after World War II and more than a dozen years after the Cold War, they follow their own national interests. They are not satellites, but sovereign states.

Britain is a sovereign state too – and it is high time the Prime Minister remembered.

CORRELLI BARNETT
Daily Mail (25.2.03)

Israeli leaders have for months made no secret that they view an attack on Iraq as a way of advancing the state's regional agenda, not only as a means of destroying Baghdad's weapons capability.

BEN LYNFIELD
The Scotsman (14.2.03)

Then there's 'the international community'. Clearly Colin Powell cannot be talking of the millions who took to the streets last Saturday. The 'international community' he's talking about must be those politicians who get together behind closed doors to decide how best to stay in power and enrich their supporters by maiming, mutilating and killing a lot of foreigners in funny clothes whom they'll never see.

TERRY JONES
The Observer (23.2.03)

Why most Tories are keen on the war is a puzzle... where is the traditional Tory view that our national interests must be supreme?

Former Chancellor Kenneth Clarke was among the few who talked sense. He suggested that the next time a bomb went off in a western city, or an Arab régime is replaced by a more extreme one, we should ask how far British government policy has contributed to it.

This is the question which needs to be asked and the one which most Tories just want to dodge, talking constantly about the evil of the Baghdad régime.

Though not so much as Blair himself, so determined to spread the ridiculous idea that because Saddam is such a tyrant, there are grounds for war. It is time Blair grew up. His view is an adolescent spasm.

ANDREW ALEXANDER
Daily Mail (28.2.03)

A report claimed this week that immigration officials are preparing to receive up to 40,000 Iraqi asylum-seekers as a result of the Gulf War.

Among them will be thousands of members of the Revolutionary Guard – sorry, the *élite* Revolutionary Guard – pretending to be refugees.

EXTRACTS FROM THE MAINSTREAM MEDIA

It's all very well the Prime Minister fighting the war on terror abroad.

But why does he not only leave the backdoor unlocked but lay out the welcome mat and leave a blank cheque behind the clock on the mantelpiece for any terrorist who wants to set up shop here?

Why the hell should we grant asylum to our enemies? We've already got half the Taliban here. Britain has become a kind of Club 18-30 for international terrorists.

RICHARD LITTLEJOHN
The Sun (14.3.03)

We charge that a cabal of polemicists and public officials seek to ensnare our country in a series of wars that are not in America's interests. We charge them with colluding with Israel to ignite those wars and destroy the Oslo accords.

We charge them with deliberately damaging US relations with every state in the Arab world that defies Israel or supports the Palestinian people's right to a homeland of their own. We charge that they have alienated friends and allies all over the Islamic and western world through their arrogance, hubris and bellicosity.

PAT BUCHANAN
Quoted in The Sunday Times (16.3.03)

Now Tony Blair has his way and his war. It is, he says, a war against chaos, for which the whole world must unite. So the "war against terror" makes way for the "war against chaos," another war against an abstract noun and as nonsensical as the "war against racism" or the "war against poverty."

Chaos is within us. Will the war against Iraq be the beginning of a process in which the whole world will descend into chaos, no piece of politician's rhetoric but terrible reality, a state from which it may never emerge?

PETER SIMPLE
The Daily Telegraph (21.3.03)

Those army boots that lasted more than 30 years (Letters) were probably made in Northamptonshire, maybe in the village of Long Buckby, which had a long tradition of manufacturing army boots

I was brought up in Long Buckby, where, in the early Fifties, there were six boot and shoe factories employing most of the population, male and female.

There were also scores of men with workshops in their own homes, making specialised footwear. In the late Fifties, however, cheap imports started to flood the market, mainly from Europe, and this triggered the demise of the Northamptonshire footwear industry.

In Long Buckby today there is not a single factory producing footwear, and very few in the county as a whole.

It's not the quality of British goods that's to blame for the sorry state of our Army's boots. The blame lies in the quest for cheapness and the poor quality of poorly paid workers elsewhere.

D.A. GAUTREY
Letter in Daily Mail (17.3.03)

I find it hard to understand the complacency that surrounds the decline in levels of UK manufacturing activity. The steady contraction of the past 20 years seems to have become a flood. In recent memory we have seen the closure of car-manufacturing plants in Luton and Dagenham and the movement to overseas production of fashion footwear and innovative vacuum cleaners.

Such high-profile companies as these represent the tip of the iceberg. A glance at the back pages of magazines promoting industrial auctions will show many companies being sold – not because they have failed but because their owners no longer wish to trade.

Eventually, the manufacturing element of GDP will reach a stage where it cannot support an environment in which strategic elements of production can survive. Is it any surprise that your Business pages question the continued survival of steel manufacturing in the UK – that business no longer has a home market that is sufficiently large to sustain it.

TONY BALDING
Letter in The Times (19.3.03)

Third-rate politicians of my generation have so completely screwed up this country that it's easy to despair about the future.

The rest of us have settled for getting on with our lives and putting our names down with the escape committee.

If there's any hope it lies with our children's generation.

And despite every attempt to brainwash them they show commendable signs of resistance...

Denis MacShane, the Europe minister, is currently on a disgraceful propaganda tour of schools, trying to sell the Euro to children.

But at Nottingham High School last week, when he put it to a vote of sixth-formers, the first hand up in support of the Euro was, predictably, the teacher's. Gradually, another nine hands went up and that was it.

When he asked who was against the Euro, 30 hands shot up straightaway.

It was the best news I'd read this year.

RICHARD LITTLEJOHN
The Sun (7.3.03)

ANOTHER FINE MESS...

IN the old Laurel and Hardy comedy movies back in the 1940s there was an oft-repeated one-liner where Ollie berated his friend with the words: "Another fine mess you've got us into, Stanley!" One is reminded of this by some recent happenings in the BNP, such as when the fiasco of the *Dispatches* TV programme last November, in which the party was subjected to cringing embarrassment by the injudicious comments of the then Young BNP leader Mark Collett, was followed by disciplinary action against Collett which suggested that he was the sole offender in the affair, with no blame attached to party leader Nick Griffin, who appointed him to his position and then authorised his participation in the programme with no prior briefing or supervision. In other words, it was all Mark's fault!

Then, a mere three months later, there appeared in the party's newspaper, *The Voice of Freedom*, a report on a member, Mr. Charlie Bickerstaffe, who had been adopted as council candidate for a ward in Barrow-in-Furness in May's local government elections. Mr. Bickerstaffe's daughter is married to a black Zimbabwean, who has given him two mixed-race grandchildren. Quite obviously, this was not his fault, and most people – whatever 'racists' they might be – would feel the deepest sympathy with him over such an occurrence.

But when all this has been said, Mr. Bickerstaffe's family circumstances quite clearly should disqualify him from even being considered, let alone adopted, as an election candidate for a party with very firm principles concerning inter-marriage and racial cross-breeding. He has chosen not to break the ties with his daughter and disown his grandchildren, for whatever reasons may seem right to him, so he should never be permitted to act as a representative of the BNP.

But not only was he adopted as council candidate but the party newspaper carried a report on the event which was couched in tones that suggested the matter was a cause for celebration and pride. Here is the quote with which the report began:-

"My son-in-law comes from Zimbabwe. He came to Britain through the proper channels. He works very hard, contributes to this country, and is proud to be British and part of a British family."

Further on, the report quoted Mr. Bickerstaffe again:-

"I'm the grandfather of two mixed-race children who I love dearly. I'm not a racist or a nazi..."

It was quite obvious from the treatment of this matter by the editor of *The Voice of*

JOHN TYNDALL offers some observations on that appalling *Freedom* report



Charlie Bickerstaffe is seen here with his black son-in-law (photograph from *The Voice of Freedom*).

Freedom – which our readers were able to see from a reprint of the item in last month's *Spearhead* – that the paper thoroughly approved of this new development in the party, which marked a departure from everything that its activists had worked and fought for over the previous 21 years. As if to rub the point in, a photograph printed with the report showed the candidate with his arm around his son-in-law, while another showed the two children resulting from the cross-racial marriage.

Angry reactions

The reactions of great numbers of people in the BNP, and of whole branches, were instant and entirely understandable. Many simply refused to distribute the paper. In one area known to me, the offending section was taken out and the rest of the paper sold – presumably at a reduced price. I even heard of one unit in London burning its copies, though that story has yet to be corroborated.

The publication of this item in the party paper was, if anything, an own-goal of greater severity than the *Dispatches* programme. Just how it ever came to be allowed is baffling, even to those (and I am one of them) who fully accept that the BNP has to employ tactics geared to the goal of winning mass public support and getting candidates elected. This kind of nonsense will not contribute to the election of one single councillor, while it will cause – and has caused – widespread anger, demoralisation and division inside the party. Just what are those in control of the party playing at?

Was this piece of insanity solely the work

of the editor of *The Voice of Freedom* and done without authorisation or approval from the chairman of the party? In the ensuing days this became the subject of busy speculation among party members. In an attempt to get to the bottom of things, I did as it is my custom to do: I went to the horse's mouth. I sent an e-mail to Nick Griffin, which read:-

"Nick: a quick yes or no will suffice. Do you personally vet each issue of *The Voice of Freedom* before it goes to the printers?"

To which came the reply:-

"Normally I proof-read it. This time, by a quirk of fate, I didn't get that page, otherwise it would have been changed, as it is clearly at odds with party policy and acceptability, however effective it may be in defusing criticism by silly local journalists."

So there we have it. Mr. Griffin normally does vet what goes in *The Voice of Freedom*, but this time, by a quirk of fate, he missed the item that has caused all the trouble – just that page, mind you, not the whole issue! I leave readers to form their own conclusions over this matter.

But even if we are to accept that Mr. Griffin did not know about the *VoF* item before it was printed, there can be no questioning that he must have known of the adoption of Mr. Bickerstaffe as an election candidate. Such a matter would most certainly have been brought to his notice and his authorisation of the adoption sought. The authorisation was clearly given, and against that background his knowledge or otherwise of the newspaper report becomes a detail.

None of this should cause surprise because back in 2001 Mr. Griffin sought to adopt as a candidate for Oldham council a woman who had three half-black children by three separate black fathers. Only the vigorous resistance of the local branch and regional organiser caused him to shelve that idea.

Mr. Griffin's explanation

Mr. Griffin clearly ascertained, from a number of angry phone calls and e-mail messages and reports from his colleagues around the country, that this item in the paper had gone down in the BNP like a lead balloon. An urgent exercise in damage-limitation was called for, and it shortly appeared in the form of a document which endeavoured to explain and mitigate what had happened. This went to ten pages and a few lines in 10pt type on A4 paper. Now as

one who is notorious, among friends as well as foes, for sometimes using two or three words where one will do, I am perhaps ill-placed to criticise over this detail, but the length of this particular communication did seem excessive even to me, given the simplicity of the issue. But Nick seemed to feel that, for the howler to be understood, a great deal of background data was needed which would justify present party approaches on the racial question, albeit that in this case, as he acknowledged, things had been taken a stage too far.


Under the curious (in view of its relevance) heading 'Freedom – Democracy – Security – Identity', the document begins with a statement of something which should not be in dispute: that the party doesn't 'hate' anyone. It goes on to say that this does not mean that we accept miscegenation as moral or normal – an assurance for which we should all, one supposes, breathe a sigh of grateful relief.

There then follows a long and rambling dissertation on the BNP's position on racial matters which really is rather superfluous because it only reflects what has long been institutional within the party, and was so for many years before Nick Griffin joined it. We accept the reality of racial differences among mankind. Nationality should be based on ethnicity. We want to walk down our streets and see faces that are British. All normal races feel the same way about their countries and peoples. There is more to the asylum question than mere economics, as some Tories would claim. We should welcome white refugees from 'Zimbabwe' because they are our kith and kin.

It is at this point that Nick tells us that this does not make us 'racists'. Well, we could have an argument about semantics here: I personally do not believe in shouting from the rooftops that one is a 'racist' because of the widespread misinterpretations that are commonly put on that term; on the other hand, neither do I believe that one should run in terror from the epithet 'racist', and be at great pains to disavow it. It is best not used but it certainly should not be considered as pejorative when it is. However, all this is quibbling over details that are not really central to the issue being examined here. We can afford in our party to have a few variations of viewpoint on such matters.

Softening down of policies

But back to Nick. From here he goes on in much the same vein, stating yet more mantras with which very few, if any, in the BNP will argue – until he comes to the point where the real argument begins. What he clearly seeks to convince BNP members of is that recent election successes, and the fact that the BNP is now widely regarded as a 'threat' to the powers that be, are the direct result of a softening down of the party's stance on the race issue, exemplified by the



MARTIN WINGFIELD
According to Mr. Griffin, the offending item in the paper was his responsibility but not his fault!

setting up of the Ethnic Liaison Committee; the granting to a Sikh writer of a regular column in the party's paper; his own announcement that the BNP no longer regards an all-white Britain as a policy objective; and his use of the metaphor 'salt in the soup' to get across the idea that a few non-white immigrants in the country are a good thing while too many are not so.

'Good intentions'

Nick goes on to argue that what happened with the unfortunate piece that appeared in *The Voice of Freedom* in February was that a policy line which had been pursued with all good intentions and with admirable results simply ran into error by being taken a notch further than it should have been by the enthusiastic endorsement as candidate of a man who approved of his daughter marrying across racial lines and giving birth to two part-black children. Let him explain it all in his own words:-

"Such calculations, of course, are precisely what led Martin Wingfield (*Freedom* editor. JT) to include in February's *Freedom* an article based on a story which appeared in a Cumbrian newspaper, in which a prospective BNP candidate shot his local opponents' accusations of 'racism' down in flames with the devastating response that 'I'm the grandfather of two mixed-race children who I love dearly.'

"Now *Freedom* is the BNP's main public mouthpiece. It is, first and foremost, a propaganda vehicle. Martin Wingfield's brief is to turn out a snappy, easily grasped summary of our ideas, and to present them in a way that demolishes the smears of our opponents... That is what a party newspaper is for..."

"In pursuit of his brief to produce a support- and vote-winning machine, the editor of February's issue has created something which is probably perfect from an external point of view... but which struck many experienced and dedicated nationalists like a wet dead rat in the face..."

"This was undoubtedly a misjudgement, and one for which, as sole editor, Martin

is responsible, but it really isn't his fault. The problem is the ambiguity and apparent contradiction which was created at the heart of the BNP when we made the historically vital switch from calling for compulsory repatriation of every last non-White to a policy of halting further immigration, reversing the tide voluntarily and ending the position whereby we native British are second-class citizens in our own country..."

Now wait a minute! Martin responsible? Here we go again – responsible, just as Mark Collett was responsible for the appalling *Dispatches* programme? Not Nick Griffin! Nick Griffin appointed Martin Wingfield editor of *The Voice of Freedom* and he has the power to sack him from that job. I have not yet heard of his having done so. It would also be very strange, indeed extraordinary, to me that, as editor of the paper, Mr. Wingfield did not, before publishing such an item, contact his boss and discuss it with him, first obtaining his go-ahead before the thing was put to print. But if we are to believe Mr. Griffin ("by a quirk of fate, I didn't get that page" – remember?), he did not do so!

But then, aside from all this, "it really isn't his fault." Then who in hell's fault was it? No one apparently. The affair gets more and more bizarre.

Supplementary to Mr. Griffin's very long damage-limitation paper, the party also produced a much shorter item: an A5-size leaflet which was sent out with some – and only some – subscribers' copies of the newspaper, also attempting to explain the Bickerstaffe item. Here the amazing claim is made that...

"The text of this article works reasonably well. However, the accompanying picture of Charlie Bickerstaffe with his son-in-law lends an approving quality to the article that has been most misjudged. Our editor has accepted that in trying to wrong-foot our opposition he got it wrong on this occasion."

So now the text works "reasonably well" and only the photo was wrong! Let us recall that Mr. Bickerstaffe was quoted saying that his son-in-law was British and speaking lovingly of his mixed-race children. Now the latter is a private matter and the business just of Mr. Bickerstaffe and his family, but the fact that it is quoted – without critical comment – in a BNP publication clearly implies that it is thought acceptable, that it indeed had, in the words of the leaflet, "an approving quality." Neither this nor the statement that the son-in-law is British – also unchallenged – strikes me as text working "reasonably well." On the contrary, it is text that amounts to an affront to the BNP membership, quite regardless of whether it was accompanied by the photographs or not.

As for Mr. Griffin's general rules of engagement around which he seeks to cloak

Contd. overleaf

ANOTHER FINE MESS...

(Contd. from prev. page)

this affair, these are all very glib but they depend on certain assertions that simply cannot go unchallenged. To begin with, the adoption by the BNP of a voluntary repatriation policy dates back, in fact, to the time when I was party leader and authorised it myself. I did so because I saw it as an acceptable first phase of the process of making Britain white again – a first phase which in fact I proposed in my book *The Eleventh Hour*. The obvious corollary of this was that, should this voluntary policy fail in its objective, a policy of compulsion would have to follow – albeit one carried out in the most humane manner, with generous aid given to those affected. This decision concerning a first-phase voluntary policy was made because I could see that Mr. Griffin, then planning his bid to take over the party, was pushing hard for it as a means to create internal divisions that would help his challenge (after only a short time previously, it should be said, writing an article in *Spearhead* in which he spoke derisively of the very same policy). I did not intend to oblige him in this quest to use the policy as a means of sowing discord, and I approved it (with its qualifying reservations at the back of my mind) in order to achieve a consensus upon which all in the party could remain united and speak as one voice.


The repatriation issue

Mr. Griffin's description of this policy change as 'historically vital' is an absurd exaggeration. It may please him to see it this way, but in fact the switch was one of small detail and merely a matter of changed language and emphasis. It is my opinion that it has played no part whatever in the process of improving the party's electoral fortunes, which have been due to other factors which I will come to in a later article. Before this, I must quote further from his text because, as a follow-on, he launches into a statement of his view of the future Britain which most nationalists will find totally unacceptable, not to say – in places – quite crazy. After speaking again of the process of (voluntary) repatriation, he says:-

"... And we all know that this will mean that a greatly reduced number of non-Whites who have integrated with our society and who now accept the new position will be allowed to stay and be granted the full protection of the law as citizens... Much though many people would rather see a totally all-white Britain, this less than perfect arrangement is the price our children will have to pay for the treason of our masters and the fact that the United States of America is under the control of multi-racist fanatics who would bomb this country back into the Stone Age if we gave them the excuse by evicting the last non-Whites by gunpoint."

It is at this point that we must count up to ten, draw a deep breath, and ponder on Mr. Griffin's words. If this really is the way his mind is working, BNP members have a right to be gravely concerned, indeed alarmed. What he is saying is that our children should be obliged to pay the price for the treason of our present and past rulers! Really? Then by that line of argument the whole purpose of the BNP is rendered null and void. We might as well not have struggled all these years to build the party up as we have. We might as well surrender to Europe, to the Third World invasion, to the decimation of British industry, to the crime wave, and much else. I was always under the impression that the BNP has been in business so that our children, and their children, and so on into the infinite future, should *not* be obliged to pay the price for the treason and folly of the existing generation of political leaders and their immediate predecessors. But apparently I have been wrong. That, according to Mr. Griffin, has to be their fate, and there is nothing we can do about it!

Then there is the assertion that we should



NICK GRIFFIN

Believes our children should be doomed to pay for the treason of our present masters

not do anything which displeases the multi-racists of America because if we do they will come over and bomb us. Now we are venturing into the realm of the totally insane. Again, this is a prescription for just giving up and doing nothing. I don't think that, in all the forty-odd years I have been in nationalist politics, I have ever heard such unadulterated balderdash, even from Mr. Griffin!

Then of course the passage contains references that are wholly misleading. Mr. Griffin says that non-Whites allowed to stay here should be granted the full protection of the law. Of course, *any* people currently

resident in Britain should be granted the full protection of the law, whether they are going to stay here or not. Who ever suggested otherwise? No one in serious politics, as far as I know.

Then there is the puerile reference to non-Whites being evicted "by gunpoint." This is just a resort to dishonest left-wing rhetoric more appropriate to the pages of *Socialist Worker*. Nick really should know better. He is well aware that such a process would never be necessary even with the non-Whites who declined to take advantage of a generous voluntary repatriation scheme and later had to be resettled overseas by act of law. As a very last resort, when people have failed to carry out a court order of whatever kind, they are arrested with the use of *minimum* force and taken to the place where that order will be executed, in this case at ports of departure by sea or air from the country. Talk of guns is just ridiculous hyperbole unworthy of a nationalist writer.

Most certainly, there are cases where exceptions even to the rule of last-resort obligatory repatriation should be considered. An example would be very old non-Whites who are past child-bearing age who could be permitted to see out their last few years in this country rather than suffer the upheaval of transfer to another part of the world. That would not in the least bit compromise the aim of an ultimate all-white Britain; it would only slightly delay it. I see no problem with the BNP consenting to such treatment as part of a package to take the hardest edges off its policy; but that is a wholly different matter from what Mr. Griffin is proposing, which is that future generations should be condemned to suffer, as the saying goes, from the sins of the fathers.

External and internal effects

There is one point, however, where Mr. Griffin has brought up a question of very vital importance which, to judge from the way he has described it, he has only just rather painfully discovered. This is where he acknowledges that, in order to put forward ideas that might have good *external* effects, the *Freedom* item could have caused great *internal* disquiet, striking experienced and dedicated nationalists "like a wet dead rat in the face." Leaving aside the question of whether such external effects would be as good as imagined – which could be strongly debated – we should indeed concentrate on the question of the repercussions this kind of stuff has within the British National Party itself. In fact, it has had very disagreeable repercussions indeed – as the reactions to this affair have clearly shown, and as those responsible should have known in advance. Here we come to a fact of political life around which some people seem quite incapable of getting their minds.

Political movements, in their quest for growth, expansion and eventual power,

always have to strike balances between two objectives that are equally important. On the one hand, they need to push outwards the frontiers of their support, winning new adherents, new activists and new voters. That is so obvious that it should hardly need stating. The alternative is to remain incestuous little clubs whose members romance about what once was and what one day should be but will never acquire the practical means to achieve anything. One gets the impression that this truth greatly preoccupies Nick Griffin, and quite justifiably so. It preoccupied me when I was BNP leader and it preoccupies all people who are in politics in a really serious way.

But on the other hand there is the need, throughout this process of expansion and enlargement, to preserve and retain the inner core of faithful workers and fighters who were first in the struggle, who pioneered the movement in its formative stages and who comprise its most dedicated cadres.

Self-defeating

These two purposes are always potentially in conflict. An excess of priority given to one can very easily jeopardise the other. In particular, an over-zealous attempt to widen the movement's constituency of support by offering all things to everybody will become self-defeating if its result is to alienate the hard core to the point of demolishing it completely. That is tantamount to erecting the walls, fittings and roof of a building while allowing its foundations to rot away. The result will be that the building will collapse very shortly after it is opened and occupied.

It goes without saying that there will always be an element among the original hard core of pioneers who are lacking in political realism and will be unable to come to terms with what has to be done for expansion to be achieved. They will constitute a loss which must be accepted as part of the tough process of the movement growing up.

But there can come a point at which this interpretation of "what has to be done" gets completely out of control. The imaginations of some of the growth-promoters run riot; and expansion schemes, and the 'gimmicks' used in pursuit of them, become ill-judged; theories are postulated as necessary to growth which are based on pure speculation and not tested in any concrete arena of cause and effect; and the original aims and purposes of the movement become entirely lost sight of as expansion becomes a self-justifying end, without regard to the question of what, in the final analysis, it is all for. Precisely this disease has afflicted the Tory Party in the post-1945 period, and no more so than at present.

And the ironic thing, at the end of it all, is that the widening public support in the name of which all the changes and compromises

have been adopted is not forthcoming; on the contrary, it is as far away as ever! That indeed has been the modern Tory experience.

And one of the reasons for this – indeed probably the most important reason – is that the people who have always been the essential *engine* of the party, its driving and motivating inner force, become so disheartened and disillusioned that they drop out, only for their places to be taken by political chancers, careerists and people of no principle – people of the kind who have given mainstream politics in Britain such an odious name.

One of the great appeals of the BNP is that it is fundamentally *different* from the parties of the mainstream – in that it is not only motivated by principle but is very visibly seen to be such. When it loses that edge, it might as well join the mainstream and give up all pretensions to being a party of radical opposition.

The test of leadership of a party – in some ways the supreme test – is whether it can successfully balance these two vital needs: of doing what has to be done to grow and expand, while at the same time doing what has to be done to preserve the party's inner essence and *raison d'être*. It is not an easy test, I know.

Here is where we come back to present controversies in the BNP.

What controversies are about

These controversies are not about a choice between growing, expanding, winning elections and achieving political power – and remaining stuck in a rut of ideological 'purity' and getting nowhere. No one who is

serious about the party entertains the latter option.

The controversies are about what *is* necessary to grow, expand and achieve power – and what is *not* necessary to those purposes. The body of opinion in the party for which I speak believes that certain policy departures and public stances now being adopted are *not* necessary for growth and for power – and in fact have nothing whatever to do with such growth and power as have so far been achieved. We believe, conversely, that certain initiatives being taken as part of the *illusion* that they contribute to growth and power contain the danger that they will knock from under us the foundations of our present strength by alienating the very people upon whose dedication and active zeal we have depended to come as far as we have.

My indictment of Nick Griffin in all this – and I know that my views are shared by a great many others in the BNP – is not that he is seeking ways of extending the BNP's support by making it more attractive to would-be members and voters; we all want these things, and they were being pursued long before Mr. Griffin joined the party. My indictment is that he seems bent on quite recklessly pursuing them in complete disregard for the *internal* effects within the party – or, if that is not the case, he actually welcomes those internal effects in that they will be to drive out loyal, dedicated long-time activists whom perhaps he regards as an embarrassment and would like to be rid of.

But in all this there is a certain inconsistency that baffles some people. Those of us who were around when Nick Griffin started making approaches to the BNP back in the mid-1990s will recall that then he was in the habit of uttering quite gung-ho expressions of militancy and extremism – so much so that even many of us old hands and supposed 'hard-liners' thought at the time that he went a bit too far. In an article last August I catalogued some of these in detail, notably his permitting in a journal he then edited, *The Rune*, an article to be published which praised the *Waffen SS*. His dramatic conversion more recently to the 'softly-softly' approach has about it something of the sincerity of Michael Portillo in his "journey of self-discovery" in the Tory Party, and leads many to wonder what exactly are Nick's real convictions – if he has any at all. Is the 'new' Nick Griffin really concerned to present to the British public an image of the BNP that will enable it to gain massed popular acceptance, or are there other reasons behind his big about-turn? Perhaps times shortly to come will provide the answer.

NEXT MONTH: 'The real reasons why we're winning' (a look into the factors making for the BNP's recent election success).



PORTILLO

Hopped from being right-wing 'hard man' to touchy-feely liberal

ALTERNATIVE POLITICS

THE description 'alternative' is nowadays applied to unorthodox approaches to medicine, energy, education, and many other fields of activity. Whatever their actual merits, these 'alternatives' imply loss of faith in conventional approaches. In medicine, for instance, dazzling examples of modern technology cannot disguise the fact that the incidence and outcome of the most common diseases remain much the same as before. And it is cogently argued that doubling the NHS budget would not produce very significant improvements in health and survival statistics (The budget has, after all, been doubled several times since 1948).

Similarly, there is growing awareness that massive investments in conventional power supplies and transport are not sustainable, producing more serious problems than they solve. "Never reinforce failure" is a wise counsel at any time; but we have to contend with powerfully entrenched organisations which have a very big stake in preserving things as they are. Thus the term 'radical reappraisal' strikes fear into all beneficiaries of the *status quo*. Such people prefer to keep telling us that we just need more of the same thing to solve stubbornly persistent problems; and not surprisingly, they are quick to dismiss any proposed alternatives as unworthy of serious consideration.

DIFFERENCE IN BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

But while recognising that self-interest is at the root of this reactionary attitude, we must also understand that what separates the 'alternative' from the conventional approach is a fundamental difference in basic assumptions. For example, the conventional treatment for most forms of cancer is directed to destroying the growth by chemotherapy, radiation and surgery; all attended by serious side-effects and with less than dramatic improvement in life-expectancy. In short, it regards cancer as a malignant, alien entity to be removed from the body by invasive techniques. By contrast, 'alternative' cancer therapy regards the disease as a failure of the body's natural immunity, and therefore concentrates on restoring and reinforcing the patient's general health. By thus removing the disposition to cancerous growths it allows what doctors understandably prefer to call 'spontaneous remission' of the disease. The point of all this is that reinforcing natural resistance to disease has to make more sense in the long run than open-ended investment in medical treatment.

The 'caring professions' label doesn't

alter the fact that they are in the treatment business; but staying healthy is everybody's personal responsibility.

And when conventional forms of treatment fail, everyone has the right to look for alternative remedies.

There's no mileage, says FRANK KIMBAL JOHNSON, in the BNP trying to look like the discredited parties of the Old Gang

So much for health and disease. Politics are about alternative socio-economic assumptions and their implications; and democratic freedom consists in the ability to make informed choices between the different policies on offer. Note the key word 'informed', since genuine democracy stands or falls on the quality of information available to the voting public regarding what each political party actually represents and intends. That information is nowadays filtered through a huge mass media network which puts its own spin on the events reported and exercises a covert censorship. Thus, seven days a week, the broadcast media blanket the entire nation with the same versions of what is going on in the world. Meanwhile the voter just wants to know what each political party 'stands for'; but what he or she gets is a spurious choice between three main parties sharing the same platform of basic assumptions behind a facade of superficial differences in emphasis and detail. Thus the 'pluralism' on which democracy is supposed to rest is actually fraudulent; it offers no real alternative to the *status quo*.

Recognition of this lies at the root of growing public cynicism and apathy towards politics in general. The present situation can be summarised as three allegedly different parties contending for what is commonly described as the 'middle ground' of British politics. There is of course no such place; it is an invention of shallow opportunists mortally afraid of being stigmatised as 'extremist', and a bogus sanctuary for

the politically naïve. Remove the pious rhetoric and the 'middle ground' is exposed as the setting for racial, cultural and national suicide.

In these circumstances it would be profoundly mistaken for the British National Party to waste very limited time and resources disputing the 'extremist' label and concocting a bland, unprovocative image for the mass media. All such efforts are bound to fail anyway.

EMPHASISING THE DIFFERENCES

The party must emphasise its *differences* from the Tory/Labour/LibDem coalition in the starkest possible terms. Never mind the 'balloon' slogans; the party's image must consist of a handful of easily remembered specific proposals for the regeneration of Britain. This extremely focused and sharply pointed campaigning strategy should leave no one in any doubt as to what a BNP government would actually do. This has the dual benefit of deflating misrepresentation by opponents and leaving them starkly exposed on the crucial issues. Everybody should be made fully aware that the main planks of BNP policy are: **repatriation of unwanted immigrants; withdrawal from the European Union; preserving the United Kingdom; a self-supporting economy; and support for the family.**

And only those who pledge support for these specific commitments qualify as *bona fide* British nationalists.

It follows that the only wasted votes in the present climate are those which maintain the disastrous Tory/Labour/LibDem coalition.

We have heard despairing voices from the moribund Conservative Party about giving the British people a 'credible alternative'. So give them one.



The BNP is unashamed to be different from the other parties in making plentiful use of national flags. There lies its appeal.

This review article was first published in The Barnes Review, PO Box 15877, Washington, DC 20033, U.S.A., to whom we owe acknowledgements.

A BODY of literature in the post-Cold War era has begun to accumulate concerning the moral defensibility of nationalism. After a century of attempting to eradicate nationalism as such from the political arena, professional philosophy has decided that, since nationalism is quite obviously more resilient than they thought, they must deal with it.

Within the last few years, two major works on nationalism and moral philosophy have been published: this present set of essays, entitled *Nationalism and Ethnic Conflict*, as well as an earlier offering, *The Morality of Nationalism*, edited by Robert McKim and Jeff McMahan (Oxford, 1997).

It is likely that nationalism provides for the greatest accumulation of literature in much of political science to date. It is a massive field, with major contributions from economics, history, philosophy and anthropology. Without much surprise, these academic treatments provide little guidance in understanding the reality of nationalism in world politics or moral theory. In all probability, these offerings reflect the present ruling class's inability to deal with nationalist resurgence (except to bomb them), providing a window of opportunity for careerist academics to contribute to a 'hot topic'.

The offerings presented here, as well as in the Oxford book, are largely prosaic. Few of the authors are themselves nationalists, and the few who are nationalists only in the strictly academic sense; that is, they might find some benefit in a few of the arguments of nationalist discourse that can be assimilated to liberal ideology. Here is the rub, and the central criticism of the present offerings on nationalist thinking: they are all self-consciously subordinated to the demands of liberal ideology. It is understood in most academic discourse in moral theory that liberalism is the 'default' political ideology. That is, after the Cold War, 'liberalism' reigns triumphant. Such a silly view is reflected in the United States' violently hostile reactions to nationalist movements at home and around the globe, in that they threaten to upset the subsidised and manufactured 'consensus' around something called 'liberal values' that conveniently appeared after the Cold War as inviolable. Therefore, modern philosophical defenders of nationalism at élite academic institutions solely play the game on the

Nationalism and ethnic conflict

M. RAPHAEL JOHNSON relates how liberals refuse to recognise the legitimacy of a political philosophy unless it meets their own conditions

left's playing field. The editor of this volume, in the introduction, makes this pompous claim:-

"Why do nationalist claims require a defence? Well, they appear to clash – some in principle, some under normal circumstances – with various values that people tend to accept. Some of these values are considered essential to liberal-democratic societies, others important for the flourishing of culture and creativity... it demands an equal moral concern and respect – at least in morally central matters – for each human being. Of course, exceptions can be made, but the burden is on those who demand special treatment. Nationalism by definition demands partiality... so it should defend its claims against impartiality." (9-10)

Therefore, liberalism is the test. Nationalism must be 'liberal' or it is not 'morally acceptable'. In other words, the rules, language, concepts, 'moral tests', conclusions, vocabulary, method of argumentation, and ethical content of the debate itself have already been decided, by an assumed liberalism that is never argued for. This is a poor example of a 'debate', but one utterly dominant in English-speaking universities. Debate is permissible so long as the rules are set by the left. These sets of essays fit this structure perfectly.

ACADEMIC CONSTRAINTS

Unsurprisingly, the defenders of nationalism such as Kai Nielsen, David Miller, Yael Tamir, Thomas Hurka, Will Kymlicka and Christopher Heath Wellman have already lost before the discussion gets started. Unfortunately, the constraints nationalists in the academy feel on the views they can profitably espouse are such as to defuse any complaints about the issue, and the intellectual dishonesty involved. It is further unsurprising that 'liberal nationalists' fail miserably in defending their positions. Nationalism is by definition illiberal and quite anti-liberal. One is a nationalist (all other things equal) because he rejects the assumptions of modern liberalism and the massive economic and pseudo-cultural power behind it.

The defenders of nationalism in this volume

and others make quite defensible and common-sense claims for nationalist positions, but, because of the constraints on them in an academic setting, they must qualify each and every one. Such qualifications seek to preserve the voluntary nature of national associations and the ideology of diversity within nations. An anti-nationalist theorist, Gillian Brock, mocks her nationalist counterparts with a deserved venom: "Liberal nationalism can distinguish itself from morally problematic forms of nationalism only if it is rendered vacuous; however, it picks up the quality of being morally demanding." (158) Her statement is true enough, but it is continued proof of the fraud involved here: if it does not conform to liberal standards, it is, *ipso facto*, 'morally problematic'.

Strikingly, these two sets of essays dovetail precisely with the demands of NATO and the American foreign policy establishment concerning the nature of nationalism in general. As the Cold War has ended, the war against nationalism has begun. To write nationalist criticism out of the academy makes sense in light of American foreign policy demands. To make any form of nationalism 'liberal' fits exactly into globalism's demand that any form of 'nationality' reflect the fundamental 'values' of the élite. In perfect concert with the bombing of Serbia by the Clinton Administration, Brock writes: "Whether a culture is worth preserving depends on some of the ethical content of the culture, how it encourages its members to treat their fellow members and non-members." (162) A culture "not worth preserving" one can imagine becomes a target. One might even say a culture "not worth preserving" is ripe for genocide, and mass murder is something liberal democracies do best, as our work in Iraq, Serbia and World War II proves quite well.

These essays are instructive in how the élite currently view nationalism as political views. It further proves the irredeemable corruption of American (and other) universities and colleges. Little new is being done, and both semi-nationalists and anti-nationalists within these pages make boilerplate claims and counter-claims. The purpose of this book, in this reviewer's opinion, is to make the statement to the effect: "If nationalism is to exist, it will exist on our terms."

Nationalism and Ethnic Conflict, edited by Nenad Miscevic, Open Court Publishing Company, 2000.



Welsh Nationalism: Liberals find this acceptable because it is non-racial and helps to divide and weaken Britain.

IN THE LAND OF THE FREE!

PRESIDENT George W. Bush and many others have been putting forward the case that the United States should spread the Western idea of 'freedom' to other countries, particularly Arab ones which are supposedly languishing under the thumbs of medieval-style despots.

While US forces rampage around the world in supposed defence of 'democracy', IAN BUCKLEY reports on what has happened to a dissident back at home

As with the irritating housewife who criticises the neighbour's paintwork while her own house falls into disrepair, there is a good deal of hypocrisy in this approach. US armed forces have recently been employed in the fight for 'freedom' – making Afghanistan safe for homosexuals and drug-smugglers – but concerned Americans should worry instead about the progressive loss of freedom in their own country.

The name of Ernst Zündel will already be known to many readers. This German-born graphics artist lived in Canada until very recently, after arriving in that country as a young man in 1958. From the start, Ernst was deeply concerned about the damage done to his homeland's reputation in the post-war years and set out to disentangle the actual facts from the morass of wartime propaganda. He eventually set up a publishing house, Samisdat Publications, which distributed very large quantities of books, newsletters and cassettes around the world.

'FALSE NEWS'

These activities triggered a trial in 1985 under the ancient law of "spreading false news." As directed by the judge, the jury, found Zündel guilty, but a mis-trial was declared on appeal, due to the judge's partiality and the suppression of defence evidence. The subsequent trial came in 1988, to which both sides brought many researchers and witnesses. Zündel's supporters giving evidence included the renowned historical revisionists David Irving and Dr. Robert Faurisson, and Fred Leuchter, perhaps the leading expert in the United States in the design of execution chambers using gas. Here, for the first time in open court, serious doubt was cast on the orthodox version of the so-called 'Holocaust'. Zündel was still found guilty, but on appeal the Canadian Supreme Court declared the law

under which he had been convicted to be unconstitutional. The legality of Zündel's publications was also fully established. Some might see the events that I shall now relate as revenge for that victory.

At mid-day on the morning of 5th February, Ernst Zündel, now living in rural

Tennessee, U.S.A., was arrested by five officials of the US Immigration and Naturalisation Service (INS), some of whom were armed. The ostensible reason given was that he had failed to attend an immigration hearing almost a year earlier. In spite of the fact that Zündel is married to an American citizen and is a law-abiding individual, he was hauled off to jail like a dangerous criminal.

We all know that the US immigration laws are disregarded readily enough when it comes to importing the maids and

menials for the American over-class. No doubt there are a quite few around at this moment cleaning out the swimming pools and tidying the lawns of the members of Bush's Cabinet. But Zündel is carted off, even though the spouse of an American citizen, something which by itself usually gives legal status. The whole affair stinks, redolent of the kind of political persecution the US deplores elsewhere, be it in Iraq or North Korea (if not in Israel). Zündel was imprisoned without an arrest warrant, a 'civil arrest' being sufficient to put him in jail. As his wife Ingrid sardonically commented: "Welcome to the New World Order!"

In modern, democratic America, the Blount County Jail where Zündel was held seems (perhaps appropriately) like something out of the witchcraft trials of four centuries ago. Zündel writes from within:-

"One other little inconvenience they employ here is that they put you in handcuffs and leg-irons, like they did in the old days to slaves. Not only the wrists but also the legs are cuffed, attached with an 18-inch-long steel chain which makes walking every step painful, as the hard, sharp edges of the steel cuffs chafe and cut into one's skin and flesh."

Had Ernst Zündel been, say, a Kurdish journalist held by Saddam, the number of outraged editorials across the globe would have been wondrous to behold. Instead, the attitude of the press was distinctly sniffish, with various vague references to a spreader of 'hate' who was more or less getting his just desserts. This misnomer may still be popular with the media but it's becoming more and more untenable, as ordinary folk begin to realise that the term – and other such labels – is basically a meaningless slur.

EXAMPLE OF REAL HATE

This is particularly true these days, when about the only people around who behave like the Nazis of propaganda are the Israeli Army, as witness the recent burial alive of a pregnant woman in her demolished Gaza home. There's hate for you – an atrocity that incidentally was ignored by both BBC and ITN news broadcasts of the day concerned. But didn't Elie Wiesel once say: "Some events do take place but are not true; others are, though they never occurred."?

In spite of the shock of his incarceration, Zündel still managed to keep an informed interest in his unaccustomed surroundings. He relates:-



ZÜNDEL

Arrested and treated like a common criminal merely for voicing his opinions


"I have pretty well interviewed most prisoners, Black, White, and Mexican, for what crimes they are in. Some of the horror stories are so grotesque that nobody would believe me. There are many young Whites here in the 20-25-year range, some a little older, who face 85 years, 78 years, 40 years, 30 years. There are many repeat offenders, mostly drug- and alcohol [-related], and dozens who are in here for driving without a licence, because it was suspended for drunk driving, over and over again. Some are doing 18-20 years for that, cumulatively.

"As a consequence, this place is seething with rage, dozens of cooped-up men with a grudge against the police and the justice system; that does not portend well for the future."

The human jungle of this Tennessee jail obviously reflects an American society that is visibly crumbling to bits. This, ladies and gentlemen, is the United States of Bush Jr., Wolfowitz and Perle, the decadent arbiter of the world that seeks to remake every country in its own image, maybe until there are 'gay porn', abortion clinics and MTV in Mecca or Medina!

'WAR CRIMES' MAN

Thankfully, Zündel was allowed to leave the Blount County Jail on 21st February, and was briefly transferred to a detention centre near the Canadian border before being deported back to Canada. Here he may stay – though still in detention – at least until the end of March. Ominously enough, the Canadian government has assigned its top 'Nazi war-crimes investigator' Donald Macintosh for the review hearing on his immigration status. Macintosh is doing a job which would



WARMONGERS FOR ISRAEL

George W. Bush (left), Paul Wolfowitz (centre) and Richard Perle (right): representative of the diseased society that America has become, says the writer.

normally be assigned to a recently qualified junior immigration lawyer. Since Zündel was barely six years old at the end of World War II, it must be highly unlikely that Macintosh will find any evidence of 'war crimes'! Still, the possibility remains of deportation to Germany to face a ten-year sentence for 'incitement' and 'defaming the dead'.

Though the Niagara detention centre in Canada doesn't quite have the communal hell-hole quality of the Tennessee jail, Ernst Zündel is (at the time of writing) being held in his cell there for 24 hours a day, unable to write notes except by using the seat of his toilet. Guards have been unable – or unwilling – to explain why, and on what authority, he is subjected to such treatment for a technical visa violation.

The real answer is of course that this shameful treatment is a product of *fear*, fear on the part of some of the most powerful people in the only superpower on earth.

Perhaps one of the most interesting comments on this, the crux of this matter and much else besides, came from one of

Ingrid Zündel's correspondents, Dr. Dommergue from France who had this to say to American officials:-

"I have known M. Zündel these last 20 years, and as a Jew I felt compelled to check what he said and published. I became conscious of the fact that he was a most distinguished mind, that he told the truth and that I could understand why my all-powerful peers did not like him!

"I feel that a country in which he resides can be proud of having him. Please give him back his liberty in the country of liberty, and keep away from the totalitarianism of my worst peers who think they have all the rights because of their financial and political power."

For any readers who would like to send messages of support and encouragement to Ernst Zündel, his current address is: Niagara Detention Centre, Highway 58, Thorold, Ontario L2V 4A6, Canada.

Should anyone wish to contact his wife, they should write to: Mrs. Ingrid Zündel, 3152 Parkway #13, PMB 109, Pigeon Forge, TN 37863, U.S.A.

MADHOUSE BRITAIN

A MAN jailed for smuggling drugs worth £268,000 into Britain has been awarded £3,000 by the European Court of Human Rights for invasion of privacy. He complained that police had been intercepting his pager messages.

* * *

THE Sherwood Forest NHS Trust has been looking to hire, in its own words, "Three outreach sessional workers for men who have sex with men."

They will "undertake awareness workshops and outreach sessions in many varied environments, for example education establishment/gay scene and public sex environments."

* * *

SELF-STYLED 'poet' Mark Patterson, reported in this column two months ago as freed by a judge in order to give him the chance to write his poetry, now faces jail on a new charge.

West Indian Patterson was let off with a drug-treatment order after appearing on a charge of robbery with violence. However, he failed to turn up for the treatment and expects this time to go down. He has more than 50 previous convictions.

* * *

FOR two centuries British Guards regiments have worn the famous Bearskin when on ceremonial duty – a tradition that has almost become part of the country's national identity.

But now the Bearskin could go as a result of protests by animal-rights activists. The Ministry of Defence has stated that it is trying to find a fake fur replacement after being inundated with complaints that the headgear is a symbol of cruelty to animals.

* * *

LUTON Borough Council is spending local taxpayers' money on a scheme to give golf tuition to the offspring of asylum-seekers in order to inculcate them in the British way of life.

* * *

THE story of The Three Little Pigs and their escape from the Big Bad Wolf has been removed from classrooms at an infants' school for fear that it will offend Muslim pupils.

And all other children's stories involving pigs, including Babe, have also been cleared off the shelves at Park Road School in Batley, West Yorkshire.

The headmistress, Mrs. Barbara Harris, has

defended the decision saying that she was being aware of the 'religious sensitivities' of her pupils, 60 per cent of whom are Muslims.

* * *

BRITAIN'S highest-paid politician, Lord Chancellor Derry Irvine (current salary £184,000 a year) created a scene at a supermarket in Tarbert, on the Isle of Bute, in late February when the check-out cashier refused to grant him a £1 dividend on a purchase of £70 of groceries because he had forgotten his dividend card.

Lord Irvine held up the queue while he had a loud argument with the cashier. He then caused more minutes' delay while he went to his car to retrieve the card.

* * *

TO pacify public feeling on immigration, the Government has approved a compulsory 'citizenship programme' for immigrants seeking UK passports, with lectures on the nation's culture, history and language.

However, instead of the newcomers being taught about the significance of Henry VIII, Queen Victoria, Nelson and Wellington, they will be familiarised with employment rights, the minimum wage, the role of trade unions and the Human Rights Act.

A CASE has come to our attention which provides an utterly staggering example of the humbug and cant of left-liberals on the subject of freedom and human rights. Mr. John Ross, writing from Scotland, addressed a letter to Amnesty International in Canada asking them what they intended to do about the case of Ernst Zündel, detailed in the article by Ian Buckley on pages 12 and 13 of this issue. Clearly, if AI is to be true to its professed principles and rules of defending the rights of individuals against persecution on grounds of their political or religious beliefs, they would take up the Zündel case. But no! Amnesty has refused to act for Ernst Zündel. We reprint here its reply to Mr. Ross's letter:-

Dear Mr. Ross,

I am attaching an editorial written by the Secretary-General of AI Canada on the Zündel case. It clearly states our position on this case and explains why we hold this position.

The Zündel Affair: Troubling Case, but the Principle is Clear

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights says it simply: everyone shall have the right to seek asylum. Everyone. It is one of the most crucial human rights safeguards that exists in our violent, unjust world. When terror and fear reign at home and one's own government is the source of the problem or refuses to be part of the solution, individuals must be able to turn to the world community for safety. The right to seek asylum is a vital means of preventing human rights violations. It is also a right under siege around the world as governments devise an expanding arsenal of laws and practices meant to keep refugees out. But the devastating reality is that keeping refugees out very often means condemning them to face the very persecutors they are trying to flee.

This week we have learned that Ernst Zündel might be seeking refugee status in Canada. His case puts this fundamental principle to a very difficult test. The widespread reaction has been that to allow a claim by this man, notorious for his crimes of hate, makes a mockery of the very notion of asylum. But the principle must hold. It does and absolutely must apply to everyone. The impartiality of Canada's refugee system and the best chance for safety of the thousands who turn to it for protection every year lies in simply letting the system do its job.

There can be no space for political interference, dictating

The nauseating humbug of the 'liberal' mind

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL WILL DEFEND SOME PRISONERS OF CONSCIENCE BUT NOT OTHERS

whose case should be heard and whose not. We know that the world over, political interference ends up in refugees being denied the protection they deserve: nationals of a particular country denied status because of a politician's discriminatory attitudes, claims made by women turned down because of a government's refusal to recognise women's rights, adherents to a certain religion or political movement rejected because of a host country's foreign policy concerns. Interference and selectivity puts refugees at risk. Once we allow it, where do we draw the line?

Maintaining the integrity of Canada's refugee system, however, is also a crucial government responsibility. It must be protected from abuse and manipulation. If the system's integrity fails, real refugees will suffer in the end. As such, officials could accelerate their consideration of this claim, to ensure that it is dealt with expeditiously, but fairly, and does not linger. This keeps both the sanctity of the right and the integrity of the process intact.

At the same time, of course, hate-crimes allegations against Mr. Zündel continue to demand investigation and justice. Our own Canadian Human Rights Commission has already ruled that he has spread hatred through the internet. Strong hate-crimes laws, vigorously enforced, are a crucial human rights tool. Refugees know the devastating human cost of hate first hand.

Amnesty International and other groups have pressed Canada to improve its laws and practices in this area, including with respect to Holocaust denial when it is motivated by hate. These obligations must also be at the forefront of the government's response to Mr. Zündel's renewed interest in Canada.

The refugee process and the justice system: the two should go hand in hand. Someone may be in Canada while their claim is being assessed or perhaps should not be deported because they face torture abroad. But at the same time they may have committed war crimes, crimes against humanity or hate crimes, for which they absolutely must face criminal prosecution. Sadly, governments, including Canada's, often get this wrong - willing to deport, unwilling to prosecute. But we cannot simply export the problem cases to other countries with fingers crossed that someone else will do the right thing. We need actively to ensure that justice will be the response (if not abroad, then here at home). Yes, justice is sometimes difficult, perplexing, and even costly. But it is the road we must travel.

Sincerely,
Samantha Burdett

Mr. Ross has written in reply:-

Dear Sir/Madam, I write to complain about the stance taken by your branch of Amnesty International as regards the detention of Ernst Zündel. Freedom of thought

and speech is a right that must be protected, yet AI Canada has not only failed to support this ideal but has actively taken up the cudgels on behalf of organised Zionism by calling for Zündel's deportation to Germany. This is an outrage, and one that has cost AI my long-term membership here in the UK. Please take time to read the short poem by Scottish poet Robert Burns:-

Here's freedom to him who would speak;
Here's freedom to him who would write;
For there's none ever feared that the truth should be heard,
Save he who the truth would indict."

You in Canada should be ashamed to call your organisation Amnesty International. You have betrayed the very name.

Signed in disgust
John Ross (Scotland)

OUR SUMMARY: It will be noted that the Amnesty International declaration written by the organisation's chief in Canada and sent by Miss Burdett consists of one long pious sermon full of high-sounding rhetoric but in substance then goes on to contradict all it has said where the Zündel case is concerned.

The declaration refers to the right of 'everyone' to asylum but it clearly does not mean everyone - if that includes Ernst Zündel!

It will also be noted that the declaration keeps repeating the word 'hate', but in fact Ernst Zündel's public career has consisted of one long struggle against hate - especially the hatred of his own German people but also hatred of nations and races generally. We have regularly read Mr. Zündel's writings over several years and we cannot recall one single word of real hate in anything he has written or published. For sheer hypocrisy, Amnesty takes the prize!

**promoting and protecting
human rights**

**Amnesty International
Canada**

Yes, but *whose* rights? Canadian Amnesty's internet logo

WHY NOT A BRITISH RESISTANCE?

THE VATICAN could properly be described as 'institutionally bigoted', since it only exists to promote the Catholic faith and therefore resists the idea of 'equal opportunities' for non-Catholics within its fiefdoms. But every institution incorporates an ethos and loyalty, which entail discriminating against those it was not intended to serve. And this includes the nation-state, whose claim to a separate existence has no legitimacy except to safeguard the unique character and culture of its native citizens.

Thus we have always been told that the first duty of any government is to defend the homeland against alien invasion; and whether the latter takes the form of military attack or stealthy infiltration is immaterial, since the end result would be the same.

It follows that only a clear mandate from the native population could excuse a government allowing, let alone encouraging, a large-scale invasion by people of alien ancestry and culture.

But as we all know, no British government has ever been given this suicidal mandate, while hundreds of thousands of aliens are still entering the country every year. This stealthy capitulation, aided and abetted by a mass media network already dominated by alien interests, has also sought legitimacy by introducing legislation designed to criminalise any overt resistance by the indigenous population.

This represents the most monumental act of treachery in this nation's long struggle to survive in a turbulent and envious world. That the treachery has been allowed to prevail for over fifty years is due to a news censorship no less repressive than that which blanketed the former Soviet Union, allied with a tacit agreement among political parties to avoid raising the subject at elections. But now, at long last, it seems the British people may be waking up to the fact that their homeland, heritage and very identity are being stolen from under their noses. The socio-economic stresses and crippling costs attending the alien invasion loom larger and larger in the public consciousness; 'political correctness' attracts mounting ridicule, and multi-racial indoctrination by the mass media is becoming seen for what it is.

A Resistance Movement

Any individual's progress through life reveals a basic cycle of behaviour comprising: (a) aspiration; followed by (b) satisfaction; or by (c) frustration – reaction to which takes one of several forms: anger, apathy, or **switching to alternative tactics or goals**. Today, after decades of frustration, there is an accumulating anger that will sooner or later shatter the complacency of British politics. Indeed, we are already hearing

anxious reports on doorstep reactions to issues like immigration, asylum-seekers, crime and the seemingly inexorable decline in public services. Indeed, the Labour Party chairman has said that local polls reveal that

A.S. HURST suggests a few practical ways to sabotage the functioning of the Blair régime

asylum-seekers/uncontrolled immigration is at the top of most people's list of concerns; and never mind Blair's posturing over Iraq. Our task, as the only political party dedicated to removing the alien presence, should be to enlist and organise public frustration and anger in two ways: namely, electoral support for the British National Party, and **civil disobedience** to frustrate and abort renegade government measures.

This campaign should concentrate its electioneering on those constituencies under most pressure from the alien influx and those of prominent politicians, thereby securing the most votes and media attention. On the civil disobedience front, it should exploit every means necessary short of criminal damage to persons and property. The essence of the matter is that British patriots should simply be uncooperative in respect of official policies like multi-racialism and Euro-federalism in particular. This uncooperativeness can range from 'passive resistance' to more active measures, sensibly designed to avoid legal entrapments. Some examples follow:-

- Boycott *all* alien firms, products, services, agencies, premises and activities; also all other firms which support multi-racialism in their employment and advertising. Circulate lists of alien and renegade firms to BNP supporters.
- Avoid employing aliens by adopting artful advertising, recruitment and selection tactics.
- Support white claimants of racial discrimination in respect of jobs and promotion.
- Avoid alien-dominated schools.
- Withdraw pupils from alien-

oriented activities.

- Object to multi-racialist teachers and material and classroom propaganda.
- Complain to local media about renegade teachers, bullying and drug-usage by aliens in and around schools.
- In any advertisement or publicity material, do not include aliens in more than eight per cent of the images and text, and never in the most prominent positions or roles.
- Do not support multi-racial sports.
- Organise demonstrations against officious multi-racism, hostels for asylum-seekers and such.
- Return unsolicited mail from manifestly multi-racialist firms in their reply-paid envelopes, and enclose BNP leaflets.
- Produce large quantities of patriotic leaflets/stickers, if necessary independently. Insert these in any books or other publications which promote multi-racialism, also in buses and trains and other areas open to the public. This has to be done prudently and *covertly* to avoid punitive legal action by the authorities.
- 'Fly the flag' on every possible occasion, such as: (a) all traditional celebrations; (b) during election campaigns; (c) Remembrance Sunday; (d) St. George's Day; (e) at anti-EU demonstrations; (f) at anti-asylum hostel demonstrations; (g) when wearing patriotic clothing or insignia; (h) when distributing nationalist literature.

The above list of examples is a *minimum response* for dedicated patriots, who will undoubtedly extend it in manifold ways according to their ingenuity, resources and local circumstances. Local groups should circulate their ideas and experience to fellow-patriots elsewhere. It goes without saying that all this will be denounced as a 'race-hate' campaign; but nowhere does it go beyond asserting national identity and exercising preference for people of our own kind.



Challenge the commissars of political correctness by displaying the flag at every opportunity, as has the owner of this antique Morris 1000.

IMMIGRATION into Britain will continue into the indefinite future at at least 200,000 a year because of the monolithic nature of the political and legal system which offers no institutional opposition. This stark fact spells serious trouble for the future of both democracy and the rule of law. For example, in a recent Populus opinion poll most voters said they had no faith that any of the major parties would do anything about the problem.

Hence the recent flurry of newspaper campaigns and features about illegal immigration will have very little effect on the ruling élite. Instead they will use such campaigns to their advantage and just brag about how much Britain "values freedom of opinion."

In fact, the current media campaign is not only futile but hypocritical and two-faced. It is the media that has consistently and viciously attacked and smeared British and European political parties that have stood on largely anti-immigration platforms. Personal abuse is hurled at politicians whose only crime is to try to use the democratic political system to get their message across on the subject.

ATTACKS ON LE PEN

Just look at the vitriolic campaign that was whipped up in the media when Jean Marie Le Pen came second place in the French presidential elections in April 2002. *The Sun*, the same tabloid that has recently been ranting on about asylum-seekers, declared in street-thug language reminis-



ASYLUM-SEEKER POPS UP IN CAR BOOT
Some press hounds want the dual luxury of shouting with the crowd against this flood while vilifying the only people who'll ever stop it.

cent of the old *Morning Star*: "What has happened in France is repugnant... the French Prime Minister was beaten by the fascists... Le Pen is a vile politician... the Fascists are on the march again!"

The *Daily Mail*, which has also been blabbing about immigration, used similar strident language. In a bold

headline it read: "The failures that created a monster." Andrew Neil, once editor of the crusading 'investigative' *Sunday Times*, wrote: "Arrogant élite that enabled this thug to rise to power." Meanwhile, "Socialists fall victim to ugly face of French politics," shouted a *Times* headline. In an eight-page supplement on "The Rise of the Far Right," the leading headline was "Menacing charm of one-eyed bully boy."

Two-faced media ranting on immigration

ANTHONY MILNE hits at the hypocrisy of journalists who protest about the asylum flood but still like to knock 'racists' like the BNP

The Times now says, in reference to the January success of the BNP in the local council by-election in Calderdale: "The party should not be given publicity and prestige by inflating its importance..."

For all its ranting in phoney protest against the current tide of immigration, it is the press that has deliberately created a climate of fear about the subject; and that is now is beginning to rebound on it. The *Mail* had the cheek the other day to complain about its own 'McCarthyite' tactics. "For our pains," wrote the editor, "we have been smeared as 'xenophobic'."

Excuse me, but who did this smearing, exactly? In a recent Mori poll 26 per cent of those interviewed were reluc-

tant to say what they really thought of immigration for fear of being branded as 'racists'. And who did the branding? you might ask. It certainly wasn't the people you met in the pub last night. And who put the nonsense into people's heads that "you do not have to be white to be British"? It was the broadcast media with their multi-cultural quiz shows and soap operas - pumped into people's homes night after night - that put the idea into people's heads, that's who!

Race and identity are not up for negotiation, whatever people say, no matter who they are or how much cultural influence or political power they have. If you are not an Anglo-Celt, you are not British, and if you are not an Arab you are not an Arab; if you are not Chinese you are not Chinese. These are simple facts of life which everyone learns at his or her mother's knee. The fact that ordinary people are made to go around denying their own ancestral identity just shows how evil the opinion-forming élites have become.

IMMIGRATION ALTERED THE NEWS AGENDA

The reason why the press has done an about-turn on the subject of recent immigration is because a few courageous journalists, like Anthony Browne of *The Times*, have foreseen all the horrifying ramifications to political, civil and cultural life that unfettered immigration is soon to bring about. Immigration has fundamentally altered the news agenda, and many reporters don't like what they have to report, with about a third of all domestic stories now involving mosques, asylum seekers, Arab terrorists, black gunmen and massive housing schemes made necessary to accommodate the newcomers.

Some worry whether their own foolishness has destroyed *fearless* journalism. Many seem not to know how far they can legally go on certain subjects. Every single paper that campaigns against continued immigration has to make soothing noises by saying things like: "We are not racists..."

immigrants have contributed richly to this country... we have no objection to genuine asylum-seekers," etc., without seeming to have the common sense to realise they are pulling the rug from under their feet. They act like editors of Arabic newspapers, who always, to be on the safe side, preface their comments with "Allah the Merciful" or "Allah the Wise." Anthony Browne made the shrewdest observation about this: "Of course multi-culturalism is 'enriching', because if it is not then it could rise up and kill us."

The most pointless thing to say is: "We have no objection to genuine asylum-seekers," since all illegal immigrants claim to be precisely that. No refugee will say: "I am not genuine." The press weaken their case by adding qualifying clauses, and thus break one of the fundamental rules of journalism.

Take Melanie Phillips, one of the most strident writers on immigration in recent years, who says that "Britain should withdraw from the UN Refugee Convention." But in the same breath she goes on to say: "This does *not* mean shutting our doors to genuine refugees." Of course it does; what else could it mean? She could quite legally and safely say: "We don't want any asylum-seekers, whether genuine or not." That is the only way to ensure that we *don't* get bogus refugees. It will be foolproof.

The argument that to withdraw irrevocably: from the 1951 Convention would be to "repudiate our international obligations" can hardly be a moral one if the Convention was signed into law in the first place without the knowledge or consent of the British people.

A CATCH IN THE SMALL PRINT!

The Sun's petition to get people to campaign against the immigration flood by sending in a bit of paper to Downing Street urging the government to **act now** contains a paragraph with the longest section of it saying: "While I support legal immigration and have no problems with those who face genuine persecution or bring a skill to our economy..." There is no point in signing such a load of hedge-betting nonsense. That one sentence might be the longest many a *Sun*-reader will ever utter in his life. The government will merely turn round and say: "We have two million people sending in petitions saying they approve of legal immigration and genuine asylum seekers." So that's all right then!

This media-blurred focus on immigration is an acknowledgement of the enormous entrenched cultural forces at work among the liberal elite, whose sinister



LE PEN

The media hate him, but some acknowledge the problems he addresses

tentacles are everywhere in public life. Careers and reputations are at stake. Journalists behave as if they are factions within political parties, playing safe and splitting hairs, watching their words. They know Britain can't go on like it is, and yet cannot sort out the issues for themselves. Many know that the unnecessary Human Rights Act has added immensely to the country's difficulties, but somehow they think they are beneficiaries of it, when in fact they are its victims.

They have painted themselves into a corner and then whinge about it. In journalistic circles there is something known as 'That-Roadism'. An all-out attack on immigration means that they will have to give more favourable coverage to the so-called 'Far Right' and its political parties. But: "We don't want to go down that road!"

In fact, the only road they have taken is to the sharp Left. Peter Riddell, a typical *Times* fat-headed left-liberal, writes: "There is a narrow line between legitimate concern and blanket xenophobia and racism." There isn't, actually. This line has been painted by the media themselves through the use of deliberately provocative and loaded street-fighting language typical of the student union – just look at the examples I have given. Or else it means they haven't the writing skills to phrase things to avoid any criticism that might be levelled against them.

If they are frightened of purely political interference or legal attacks, then this should make them and us all worry deeply.

For a long time, we've thought about it and talked about it, but now we're going to do it. We plan some time in the next year or so to produce a large volume containing the best articles written in *Spearhead* over the near four decades of its existence as a magazine. The work will be titled *The Best of Spearhead*. It will cover the whole period from the first issue printed in December 1964, and will run to somewhere between 150 and 200 articles by most of the leading writers in the nationalist movement in Britain over that time.

This work has long been in demand but we have constantly put off the task of producing it because of the very large volume of human labour involved in its compilation. Selecting the articles will not be easy, but even more difficult will be the production phase of the operation, which will involve setting the articles up in published page format, with the appropriate headings and illustrations. This

The Best of Spearhead

will, inevitably, be time-consuming.

Our editor has been putting off this project over all these years because it has seemed that the only option would be to undertake it all himself. Now, however, one of the magazine's readers and keen supporters has volunteered to share the task, and we have made a start already over the past few weeks.

Actually, we will be able to speed up the production of *The Best of Spearhead* if we can recruit one or two more volunteers.

The work required will involve scanning photocopies of old articles, then copying the text of each onto floppy disk. The disks will be forwarded to our editor, who, possibly alone or

possibly with an assistant, will set them into pages. This work will therefore require possession of a computer and scanner and the know-how involved in this aspect of desktop publishing. The operation of the scanner would in fact be quite simple, and assistance in know-how can be provided if necessary. Would anybody who thinks they are able to help please write to the editor.

In addition to help in the production phase, we would also appreciate it if readers in possession of back copies would let us know any particular articles which they think have special merit and would like to see republished. We are already going through old issues and choosing articles, but it is not too late to add further choices to them if enough readers ask for them to be included. Just write and let us know.

All queries should be made to:-
PO Box 2471, Hove, East Sussex BN3 4DT.

The myth of racial equality

COLIN VERNON
says it's time to
tear off the
wallpaper and
look at the
cracks

The meeting place

Let us, for just a fleeting moment, leave these dark ages of political correctness and journey back in time to the 19th century. It is 1865, and Darwin's best seller, *On the Origin of Species*, has been in print for six years, as has Charles Dickens's *A Tale of Two Cities*. The connection between electricity and magnetism has long since been established (Michael Faraday), but another 13 years must elapse before electric light is invented. Thus the large, provincial city hall which we now visit is still illuminated by gas.

The lecture

As we enter the auditorium the Chairman is introducing one of the most eminent of his calling, who is about to present his long-awaited paper which, it has been said, will represent a gigantic step forward in the understanding of our world and the people who occupy it. Anticipation fills the air. The proverbial pin, if dropped, would resound in every corner of the packed room.

The speaker begins by urging his learned colleagues to abandon all previously held concepts and to accept, unquestioningly, a dramatic revelation. This is that all men, from the Aborigine of the Antipodes to the Eskimo in the Arctic regions, from the Far East through darkest Africa and Western Europe and on to the native Americans of the New World, are exactly equal **in every respect**. Any notion that they might have, for example, varying-sized brain-boxes, different capabilities or distinctive cultures is false. At this juncture, a

ripple of mirth can be heard from the audience, but the speaker is now in full stride and undeterred. He goes on to explain that great feats in engineering and discovery, together with colossal achievements in literature and musical composition have no connection at all with ethnic origin. The railway could as easily have been invented in the Congo if the people had needed it; and, technically, the Cree war chant is well up to anything strung together by Beethoven but has, sadly, been neglected by European critics.

By this time, a few impolite guffaws can be heard, but these do not prevent our hero from going on to observe that

Greek drama was nothing special and doubtless matched or bettered in a dozen other places where, unfortunately, nobody happened to have a pencil on hand to write down the words. This gem seems likely to bring the house down and, worse still, an elderly gentleman in the fifth row is having convulsions and appears to be on the brink of a heart attack. Luckily, someone with great presence of mind has had a word with a constable standing in the doorway, and now we see two well-built young men, one of whom is carrying a straightjacket, striding down the aisle. Before they can reach the platform the speaker, still going strong, invites us to believe that if a couple of hundred bushmen could be recruited and given a crash course in the English language and basic law, they could then replace the entire Lancashire Police Force and we would never know the difference.



Australian Aboriginals, seen here performing a ritual dance. There should be no 'hate' for these people, but the idea that they are just the same as Europeans is so absurd that in saner times it would laughed out of court.


Searching for the truth

So much for the fiction! Now, in the real world of 2003, it is the madman at the lectern who is in charge, while we the audience sit meekly in our straightjackets waiting for the next piece of lunacy to be enshrined in legislation. Our forebears dealt in facts. Throughout the ages, enquiring minds have delved into anything and everything that could be investigated. What would they have thought of a Home Secretary who said: "Yes, that is scientifically true but you must not say it"? As a rule, educated folk neither hated nor despised those belonging to other races, though they did study the physical characteristics, capabilities, folklore and customs of different peoples. The operative word here is 'different'. Roget's *Thesaurus* (1912 edition, entry No 465) gives discrimination as "Distinction, perception or appreciation of difference..." From this we can deduce that our ability to discriminate is an upmarket way of saying: "We can tell the difference." There is thus no evil in discrimination as such. Indeed, unless we are brain-dead it is likely that we will begin to notice differences from our waking moments and discriminate accordingly hundreds of times during the day.

Life in the madhouse

Those of us fortunate enough to possess a few old reference books can easily access the painstaking work of genuine scientists and the sincere, uncomplicated opinions of genuine statesmen. Thomas Jefferson, author of the *Declaration of Independence*, third President of the USA – and thus perhaps not your typical Nazi storm-trooper – sets out his views on slavery (1785) which include a down-to-earth layman's (but nevertheless first-hand), appraisal of racial differences which is reflective, compassionate, unbiased, yet honest, uncompromising and with no punches pulled. The full text can be found in *Webster's Encyclopaedia* on CD-ROM. But quote from it and you could find yourself in considerable trouble!

Similarly, those of us of the older generation were, as mere schoolboys, able to study at our leisure the results of genuine anthropological research which explained, precisely and scientifically, the underlying reasons for the different characteristics, abilities and attitudes of the main races of our



THOMAS JEFFERSON
Understood and frankly acknowledged racial differences. Was he a Nazi?

planet. Even today, those who profess to be bewildered as regards different capabilities in the classroom need to do no more than open the right book to find the answer. And the book, if it is honest, will confirm that no amount of money, special facilities or improvement in social environment will alter one jot the situation as it presently stands. Such books, already collecting dust, will undoubtedly be burned in the new world order. Reflect, if you will, that the suppression of established fact does no service to any race on earth but only leads to misery for all.

A fresh start

It will be self-evident that nothing will improve until we tear to shreds all the benighted junk that has been written about racial 'equality' – perhaps the reddest red herring the world has ever seen – and discuss the race issue openly and honestly, drawing freely on all the information and evidence which is readily available to us if we have the courage to use it. If this line of approach is followed with goodwill and with good intentions, then the mayhem and violent disorder which threaten to engulf our land may yet be avoided. But where will we find an ounce of courage amongst the political low-life that has hi-jacked our democracy. We have to begin again and perhaps

recall the words of that doyen of British literature, Sir Walter Scott, "Without courage, there cannot be truth; and without truth there can be no other virtue."

GERMANY

Bid to ban NPD fails

IT was reported last month that the outrageous attempt by the German authorities to ban the nationalist National Democratic Party of Germany (*Nationaldemokratische Partei Deutschlands*) has hit the rocks, and the ban is now very unlikely.

The authorities moved to impose the ban after a series of racial attacks on immigrants for which the media jumped in immediately to blame the NPD, though in fact not a shred of evidence was ever produced to suggest the party was responsible – while at the same time, as in Britain, a far higher number of race attacks by immigrants on Whites was played down.

Such 'evidence' as the state was able to garner came from 'moles' that had been placed in the NPD by the Federal and state governments. As soon as these agents became exposed for what they were, the credibility of their testimony crumbled. The Constitutional Court hearing the case ruled that the government's use of paid informers left it open to charges that it was relying on *agents provocateurs* in its efforts to ban the party.

FRENZ
A regional deputy leader of the party, he was working for the Government



One such mole, Wolfgang Frenz, became a regional deputy leader. He reported that anti-Jewish remarks had been made at a party meeting but the investigation established that the remarks had in fact been made by Frenz himself!

Guardian reporter John Hooper, writing on the fiasco from Berlin, said that according to the court: "The party was, in part, responding to the Government's dictates. The presence of the state at the leadership level makes influence on its aims and activities unavoidable" (our emphasis).

The story should be another warning as to how state agents infiltrate nationalist parties in order to damage them from the inside.

Foreign ferns, ducks, crabs, deer, beetles and other imported alien life forms have been devastating Britain's eco systems and threatening its native populations. A number of worrying developments in recent years indicate that the problem is widespread and getting steadily worse.

Native animals endangered

"ALIEN INVADERS PUT RARE BRITISH ANIMALS AT RISK" (*The Sunday Times*, 20th September 1998)

Alien invasions!

ROB SMYTH examines some threats to Britain's ecology

Many indigenous species in Britain, including the beautiful red squirrel, the water vole and the dormouse are now threatened with extinction. Despite a species recovery programme run by

natural habitats by the mink, an insatiable killer that goes on killing even if it is no longer hungry.

Muntjac deer from China and Taiwan, irresponsibly settled on country estates for over 150 years, have been wiping out rare flowers and plants favoured by the dormouse and other threatened animals.

Red squirrels are on the point of extinction following the invasion of the less attractive, but more aggressive and

prolific grey squirrel. This has led to a policy of slaughtering the newcomer, but even this policy appears to have been too late and ineffective. For it seems that now the red squirrel is traumatised by the

Britain and most of Britain's best-loved trees are a target for its greed, including the maple, sycamore, horse chestnut, elm, poplar, willow, pear and apple. Even the oak may be in danger. If the pest is not stopped from entering the country in the first place, the damage it does can only be limited by destroying trees which support it. As Ronnie Burgess, head of the Forestry Commission's plant health service, told *The Times*:-

"There is no form of control other than finding a tree that has larvae in it, felling it and mushing it up."

This is something that does not exactly beautify the countryside.

Peril in the water

"SOMETIMES THE INDIGENOUS PLANT POPULATION IS CROWDED OUT BY FOREIGNERS" (*The Times*, 27th July 1966)

As early as 1966, *The Times* reported that alien balsam plants were proliferating in the British waterways and crowding out other, more interesting, native plants. They were already spreading along rivers, streams and roadside ditches in both the north and south of England; and even some woods well away from water were knee-deep in balsam.

River and pond life are also threatened by the Chinese mitten crab, first introduced in 1912 and now well established in the Thames. Species endangered by this ugly little alien include the rare white-clawed crayfish. Another alien we could well do without is the North American bullfrog, which *The Sunday Times* (20th September 1998) reports has been "blamed for devouring rare pond life." At the same time, the paper says:-

"Imported newts threaten the long-term existence of rare amphibians such as the great-crested newts because of cross-breeding."


The paper also quotes Jim Foster, of the conservation group Frog Life, as warning:-

"Predators imported from abroad and then released into the wild can cause havoc."

The importation of North American bullfrogs has now been banned, but is the ban being enforced?

Wetlands wildlife denied life

"PEVENSEY LEVELS... UNDER ATTACK FROM FOUR ALIEN SPECIES" (*The Times*, 3rd February



The red squirrel (above) is now threatened with extinction by alien invaders

English Nature, *The Sunday Times* reported that population decline had only been halted in a quarter of the 200 rare species identified; and that English Nature's efforts are...

"being hampered by voracious foreign invaders such as the mink, the North American bullfrog and Chinese crabs."

Water voles declined by 70 per cent in number during the 20th century: they were slaughtered and driven out of their

prospect of reclaiming lost territory and often suffers disease and sometimes heart attacks as a result.

Trees under attack

"TREE-EATING BEETLE INVADES BRITAIN" (*The Times*, 9th January 1999)

After the ravages of Dutch elm disease, British trees face a new deadly enemy – an Asian long-horned beetle. This comes to Britain as a stowaway in infested wooden Chinese packing crates. There is no natural predator for it in

1999)

Parrot's feather and fairy fern have been declared a menace by the Environment Agency because they and other foreign plants are clogging British waterways. The foreign plants form dense carpets on the water surface, reducing oxygen levels and killing fish and invertebrates. There is particular concern about their effect on wetlands. These include Pevensey Levels, which is the largest and least fragmented area of lowland wet grass in south east England, and famous for dragonflies and fresh-water molluscs.

Meanwhile, the Chinese water deer introduced into East Anglian wetlands devours the waterdock, putting at risk the rare copper butterfly which lays its eggs on the plant.

More alarming is the *Daily Telegraph* report (15th July 2000) that an Asian clam...

"is breeding so rapidly in the Norfolk Broads that scientists believe it could spread throughout the country, blocking pipes and rivers and killing indigenous species."

It now appears to be too late to deal with this particular intrusion, as there seems to be no scientific way of controlling the clams without endangering native fauna.

Ruddy ducks

"WAR WAS DECLARED YESTERDAY ON THE RUDDY DUCK, AN AMERICAN IMMIGRANT THAT IS ENDANGERING THE DUCKS OF EUROPE..." (*The Independent*, 29th July 1995)

A few of these immigrants came to Britain from the United States in the 1960s, but by 1995 they had grown in numbers to an estimated 3,500. Of particular concern is the way in which they like to breed with white-headed ducks, producing fertile hybrids. Ruddy ducks and their hybrids dominate other waterfowl in breeding grounds.

In 1995, the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds and other conservation groups approved a plan to shoot ruddy ducks to protect native species throughout Europe. *The Independent* (29th July 1995) reports the UK Ruddy Duck Working Group as saying that:-

"A strategy of waiting to see what happens could result in the extinction of the white-headed duck."

Evidently, the RSPB plan of 1995 was not very effective, as *The Mail on Sunday*



The wild daffodil: immortalised by Wordsworth

reports (2nd March 2003) that the Government has now decided to instigate an official cull of almost all ruddy ducks in Britain. Why is the Government taking an interest at this late date? It is not to save British ducks – it is in order to save the white-headed duck in Spain! As the *MoS* reports, the 'British' ruddy duck...

"is migrating to Spain and mating with the white-headed duck, producing a 'mongrel' that could force the indigenous breed into extinction."

If only the Government showed such concern for British wildlife!

New pests identified in 2002

"EXPERTS HAVE IDENTIFIED FIVE NEW PESTS THAT HAVE INVADDED THE COUNTRY OVER THE LAST 12 MONTHS" (*Daily Mail*, 1st February 2003)

There are fears that these new pests, from Asia, North America and Central and Southern Europe, could become a serious threat to British gardens, attacking trees and shrubs. The *Daily Mail* reports a warning from the senior entomologist of the Royal Horticultural Society as saying:-

"Once a pest is established in gardens, it is generally too late for an eradication."

It is vital, therefore, for these pests to be dealt with urgently.

'Botanical racism'

The lovely wild daffodil in the Lake District was immortalised by Wordsworth's famous poem – 'I wander'd lonely as a cloud...' But even this is under threat from alien plants and hybrids. *Times* gardener Stephen Anderson, writing in *The Times* (19th March 2002) commented:-

"The desire to see Wordsworth's daffodils uncontaminated by immigrant stock seems no more than botanical racism."

Happily, however, he concluded that there were good reasons for saving the wild daffodil, and not only for sentimental and nostalgic reasons. As he says:-

"There is value in keeping such self-perpetuating colonies of a true species pure, so that people can appreciate the difference between them and the massive, highly-coloured hybrid daffodils seen in gardens and florists."

There is clearly much that we can learn from nature!

The need for constant vigilance and action

"HISTORICALLY, THERE HAVE BEEN WAVES OF INVADERS AND WE HAVE HAD TO TACKLE THEM" (Dr. Roger Mitchell, species co-ordinator for English Nature, quoted in *The Sunday Times*, 20th September 1998).

Unfortunately, there has been widespread complacency about the threat posed by alien invaders, as well as a lack of determination and urgency in dealing with the consequences when they become apparent. Action, when taken, too often appears to have been too little and too late. There seems to have been no national policy to deal with the menace or to awake the national consciousness to the threat posed by alien invaders.

It is essential that the Government take full responsibility now and initiates a firm and effective policy to prevent devastating invasions by alien life forms in the future and to limit the damage being wreaked by past intrusions.

Delay can be fatal. Once a native population has been destroyed, it has been destroyed for ever!

VOCABULARY FOR THE POLITICALLY AWARE

AIDS

Auto-Immune Deficiency Syndrome. This disease originated in Africa and is now widespread among negroes, Latin-Americans, homosexuals and drug-addicts in the West. It occurs among bi-sexual and heterosexual people but on a relatively insignificant scale. It represents no hazard to people with normal, wholesome life-styles, except when they are inadvertently exposed to the body-fluids of AIDS-carriers – as can occur in the context of medical, dental and nursing work (e.g. blood transfusions and surgery), catering, police work, and of course violent encounters. There is evidence that, contrary to official propaganda, the disease *can* be transmitted by condom-users, shared utensils and drinking-vessels, towels, toilets, kissing, biting and many other vectors where infected blood, saliva, urine or mucus occurs. The delay in onset of symptoms makes it difficult to prove the actual time, place and source of the infection.

A huge official publicity campaign has been launched, with enthusiastic support from the homosexual lobby and medical profession, suggesting that AIDS is a major public health 'problem'. The real truth of the matter is that...

- The homosexual lobby, powerfully entrenched in the heart of the Establishment, in the media, the professions, education and the entertainment industry, is terrified of being socially stigmatised and isolated as the prime source of AIDS infection. Accordingly, it has to promote a fraudulent public health 'problem' and play down the risk of associating with homosexuals. **Had the disease not been predominantly homosexual, carriers would have been subject to compulsory identification and segregation, as is the case with smallpox, cholera and other potentially lethal diseases.**
- For obvious reasons of self-interest, the medical profession and drugs industry are cashing in on this spurious 'epidemic', hoping to attract huge research grants and 'jobs for the boys'.

ANAL

Acronym for the so-called 'Anti-Nazi League', a malodorous motley of left-wingers, liberals and aliens.

Anti-Semitism

A label commonly (but inaccurately) attached to any activity opposing Zionism and Jewish power; a Jewish supremacist doctrine. The term is fundamentally inaccurate and dishonest, since most Jews are not racially Semitic.

Apartheid

Afrikaans word for 'apartness' (separate development) for the different races. Bitterly opposed by liberals and negroes who were desperate to conceal the funda-

mental racial differences on which it was founded. But the post-Apartheid, black-dominated government of South Africa has proved the very thing its supporters were most anxious to conceal, namely the black people's total dependence on the white population for any kind of modernity and progress.

Agent Provocateur

Person who infiltrates an organisation or society in order to create conflict and disunity to bring about its destruction.

Alien

Any person within the territory of a nation-state who is not of the same racial stock as its native people.

Asylum-seekers

Euphemism for illegal immigrants. Genuine political refugees would and should seek sanctuary as close to their own countries and racial roots as possible.

The fact that so many so-called 'asylum-seekers' travel half-way round the world to reach the affluent Western countries is evidence enough of their fraudulent status.

'Bimbo'

Slang term for sexually-attractive media woman with a good speaking voice and politically correct attitude. Also applied to feminists attempting to occupy traditionally male roles.

Bigotry

Obstinate and unreasonable adherence to preconceived notions in the face of reliable contradictory evidence. Commonly applies to political and religious zealots but, surprisingly enough, can even apply to so-called scientists unwilling to accept challenges to their own positions. One cannot, of course, be 'bigoted' about what is manifestly true (like gravity); therefore the label won't stick to race-and-nation patriots. But it will always be the case that people call themselves and their friends 'dedicated', 'committed', 'loyal' and so on; whereas their enemies are 'bigoted'.

'Balance of Power'

Describes a policy operated by one state to curb the power of another state thought to be potentially a danger to it. The method is to encourage alliances of rival states which in sum total might balance the power of the perceived dangerous state. This was a sound principle of British foreign policy for centuries before it became outdated.

In the last resort, all power is military; wars are won by those with superior manpower or weaponry or both. The white race is massively outnumbered by other races, and would long since have been subjugated or massacred but for its superior weaponry and skills and other unique attributes. It is therefore manifestly self-destructive treachery to supply advanced weaponry to other races.

'Blonks/Blonking'

Media slang referring to gratuitous and disproportionate insertion of Blacks 'on camera' in popular TV soap-operas and advertisements. So even when Blacks cannot be 'shoe-horned' into the plot, they are inserted into the background as 'screen-fillers'. The aim is, of course, to saturate the public with multi-racialism.

Consumerism

The religion of materialistic societies and the international money-power, for whom people are never more than consuming units dependent on credit-manipulators.

Consumerism tends inexorably towards the nightmare worlds envisaged by novelists like Huxley and Orwell. Sometimes described as the 'gospel of greed and groceries'.

Covert Nationalism

When, as now, overt expression of nationalism exposes people to official disfavour and harassment, and to attacks by the mass media, Rentamob and alien thugs, they tend to 'go underground' and limit themselves to passive resistance to the current régime. Such people represent the hidden part of the nationalist iceberg on which the corrupt Establishment will ultimately founder.

'Crapology'

Derisive term for pseudo-scientific and pretentious 'explanations' employing fashionable jargon. Aptly applied to much contemporary sociology, psychology, psychoanalysis, anthropology and literary and art criticism, as well as to the outpourings of advertisers, PR firms and 'image-makers'. The BNP should award honorary doctorates in Crapology to many of its most vociferous opponents (see the definitive tract on 'Metacrapology' by F. Kimbal Johnson).

Culture

A unique compound of language, literature, art, music, science and technology within a dominant racial and ideological framework. There is of course an historical hierarchy of so-called 'cultures', ranging from the Neolithic base to the Aryan apex. It is the manifest superiority and success of Caucasian/Aryan culture which attracts so many would-be 'evolutionary hitchhikers' from elsewhere.

Conspiracy

By its very nature very difficult to prove in a court of law, but often the only explanation for certain historical events and outcomes. A recognised tactic of conspirators is to pose as 'victims' as a way of diverting suspicion from themselves.

Given the weight of circumstantial evidence relating to Zionist conspiracies, argument about the authenticity of the *Protocols* becomes superfluous.

To be continued

So it does cut both ways

In the crazy world of *Cool Britannia*, racism occurs only one way – white on black or on brown. Well that's how it used to be until the BNP began to notch up some well-deserved victories in local elections. Now Phil Woolas, a government whip in the Commons and Labour MP for Oldham East – surprise! surprise! – is urging the CRE to take attacks on white people seriously. Doing this would, we suppose, increase the Commission's workload at least twelvefold, but there is a more sensible alternative. This is simply to scrap the CRE itself and all the noxious legislation that underpins its ludicrous activities. The fact is, Mr. Trevor Phillips, that the game is up. Our patient, tolerant, hard working British folk are through with being told how they should behave in their own British Isles. Go find yourself a proper job!

And now some of the names

We have previously mentioned that breed classified as non-domiciled by the Inland Revenue, and who thus pay nothing towards running Britain. Amongst these we may note: 'Curry King' Gulam Noon, said to be worth £50 million, David Potter, chairman of the computer outfit Psion, Lakshmi Nittal, a steel magnate and Christopher Ondaatje, international financier. Interestingly, this quartet have something else in common. They all make substantial contributions to the Labour Party!

Whilst on the subject of parasites, we shared the nation's profound melancholy when it was announced that Derry Irvine's £22,000 salary rise had been put on hold in the wake of scathing media comment and coverage. However Tony's 'Lord' Chancellor – he's the one with a penchant for expensive furnishings when you pay for them – has no problems when it comes to finding other ways of spending our money. When Labour came to power in 1997, Derry's department was spending just £400,000 a year on lawyers, accountants and consultants. This has now soared by 600 per cent to £2.5 million and, naturally enough, the 'Lord' Chancellor's top-quality legal eagle chums charge ten times the rate earned by mere legal aid lawyers.

THE WAY WE LIVE NOW

Some observations on contemporary society by JUNIUS

Invasion of the money snatchers...

Just three years ago, solicitors Martin Halliday and Mark Reeves needed only modest office space and employed a handful of staff. But today their 50-strong team occupies two whole floors in Chad House, Gateshead. Local business picking up a bit perhaps? Far from it! These two gentlemen have been awarded contracts worth a potential £3.6 million by the Legal Services Commission, their onerous duties being to help process asylum applications and to provide information to foreigners who want to stay in our British land. Can it be doubted that this madness will go on and on so long as we all look the other way?

... and the plus factor

However, Daoud Zaaroura, chief executive of the North of England Refugee Service, comes over as more upbeat, observing: "The number of refugees is a positive factor in terms of reviving the economy and culture of the North-East. If we are going to win the Capital of Culture [award], we need to be multi-cultural. I think there are more benefits than problems, such as the fact that housing markets in areas where no one wants to live are being revived."

But none of this will be of any comfort to the 1,500 North East pensioners who freeze to death every winter. Pitiable, weak-kneed Albion, how much longer will you slumber?

... plus a cost we cannot calculate

"Flow of asylum-seekers costs £3.5 billion in two years," declares a newspaper headline. Our Home Office would, of course, like very much to draw a line under this figure, which represents, after all, nothing more than a charge on the long suffering taxpayer and unwanted pressure on our slender resources, and thus wholly ignores the true cost to the health, well-being and safety of

our shamefully oppressed British folk. Time for Blunkett to come up with some statistics? For a nation already indelibly scarred by wave after wave of unwanted and unnecessary immigration, this must be the straw to break the camel's back!

A merry month for nationalists?

Labour's rank and file can scarcely believe that the heirs of Keir Hardie have been intent on waging full-scale war on Iraq. And, in May's local elections, they are liable to defect in droves. None of these votes will be transferred to the party 'led' (at least at the time we write this) by the 'Mad Monk' Iain Duncan Smith. And surely most working folk can spot a self-seeking charlatan in the shape of Charles Kennedy of Liberal-Democrat fame. Couple this with the growing appreciation that only BNP policies can save race and nation, and it seems to us that more seats will be gained by the party next month. The situation is as favourable as it will ever be.

The Art of Self-destruction

...

Surely there are few script-writers able to match, or even come close to, the continuing story of the Tory party in decline. When the rank and file chose IDS they doubtless believed in his ability to stop the rot and to present a face more closely resembling traditional Conservative thinking. Sadly, he dreamed a dream whereby he would be all things to all men, ending up with 'modernisers' (what a ghastly word) in some key positions, and local party backwoodsmen, as he might well have projected, literally foaming at the mouth. After that, another *volte face* and even more trouble as the Portillistas discovered their betrayal and audibly grumbled in dissent at the very core of the Parliamentary party. And through all this we have had the lunatic quest for the policies

considered most likely to put this motley bunch of opportunists back in power. Inevitably they look sillier every day.

... and sleaze at the grass roots

Not that individual MPs are much help to a beleaguered leadership. Readers know only too well that in this column we try to believe the best of anyone and everyone, friend or foe, who comes within our purview. However, with the kindest inclinations imaginable we must seriously doubt whether Tory MP Michael Trend mistakenly designated a friend's London flat as his main residence, thus enabling him, under a ludicrously overgenerous expenses system, to put in a false claim for £90,000 in respect of his £700,000 Windsor home. Surely, even a mere legislator should not have found himself "muddled and naïve in his negligent understanding" (his words) of how the system worked. For this clumsy piece of juggling he has been banned from the House for a fortnight!


Iraq: the facts and the fiction

(1) Article 6 of the Nuremberg Charter of 1945 describes a crime against peace as including planning, preparation and initiation of war. Furthermore, such crimes against peace carry individual responsibility. Thus Bush and Blair should be arraigned for their crimes within their own judicial systems.

(2) Article 2(4) of the UN Charter requires all members to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the UN. This means that if Bush, aided by Blair, attacks Iraq without any authority, then both can be charged with war crimes. And hanged? Or is this less fashionable now that the boot is on the other foot?

(3) The armed forces of a nation-state are, primarily, obliged to protect its territory, its folk and its interests. Thus if Blair orders British troops to attack and murder the folk of a distant land, without there being the slightest provocation for such an onslaught, then he, and all his ministers are guilty of High Treason.

Does Washington's favourite rent-boy have the slightest idea where he's going?



The Editor
'Spearhead'
PO Box 2471
Hove
E. Sussex BN3 4DT

SIR: Arnold Lunn, writing in 1936 in his book *Within that City*, had the following to say:-

"England today might be compared to an elderly civil servant who has had an adventurous youth but whose ambition is to retire on a fat pension and to spend his declining years in peace and comfort. We have lost the will to live, and our declining vitality is reflected in the declining birth-rate, which now, as in times past, is the infallible passage of the end.

"Perhaps the most important single factor in the defeat of Greece by the Roman troops was race suicide. 'In our time,' writes Polybius, 'all Greece was visited by a dearth of children, for this evil grew upon us rapidly, and without attracting attention by our men becoming perverted by a passion for show and money and the pleasure of an idle life, and accordingly not marrying at all or, if they did marry, refusing to rear the children that were born, or at most one or two out of a great number, for the sake of leaving them well off and bringing them up in extravagant luxury.'"

RAPHAEL SHEEHAN
Newton Abbot, Devon

SIR: George W. Bush is a clown; he exults in the delusion that he is waging a war on terrorism when all the while he is being manipulated by oil interests. He is the oil companies' man, although he probably has not realised it.

There are those who say, and with some justification, that the events of September 11 were orchestrated and executed by the secret services – probably the CIA – to manufacture a justification for the invading of Iraq, which had been planned long before 9/11.

Demolition experts agree that the Twin Towers collapsed exactly as though they had been mined; certain Twin Towers personnel were entirely and conspicuously absent on the day it all happened. A coincidence? Unlikely.

America is fast running out of oil, and abundant supplies must be procured soon. Therefore no price is thought too high to pay for unlimited oil; what are a couple of skyscrapers and a few thousand lives set against an ocean of life-giving oil?

When the pirates invade Iraq they will steal the oil, but what will phoney Tony and Britain get out of it in exchange for our dead?

N.G. CHARNLEY
Blackpool, Lancs.

SIR: In recent months, a number of British companies have transferred their tele-sales operations to India, throwing thousands of British people out of work.

The reason is that Indian employees are much cheaper than those in this country.

It may be, however, that these companies have scored an own-goal. On a number of occasions this year I have been 'phoned from long distance by people with Asian accents who are virtually unintelligible. Not many customers are likely to buy a product or service if they can't understand what the caller is babbling about!

Maybe the foreign tele-sales operators will start demanding that their pay be brought into line with that of their British counterparts.

Now that would upset the applegate!
MATTHEW ARMITAGE
London N. 11

SIR: May I, albeit belatedly, as a Christian and a nationalist, be permitted to register a protest at some of the sentiments expressed by Frank Kimbal Johnson in his article 'Defending the Faith' in the January issue? A few of his remarks would not be out of place in the most rabid left-wing corner of the rationalist press.

First, Mr. Kimbal Johnson refers to Voltaire's "shrewd observation" that as long as men believe in absurdities they will go on committing atrocities. Just what are the absurdities which the Church has sought to impose? If he speaks of Romanist ritualism, or Bible-rejecting modernism, he may have a point; but orthodox doctrine equates to faith in Scripture as the verbally, plenary inspired word of God, proclaiming the Gospel of God in the Person and work of our Lord Jesus Christ – nothing absurd about that, but something gloriously relevant, not only for yesterday but for today and tomorrow.

Second, and even more intriguing, is the writer's contention that "progress in science plus advances in education and historical research have eroded the foundations of Christian theology to the point where credulity ends and blind faith is all that remains." He does not elucidate nor enlarge on this, and one is left with the impression that this has been lifted out of that expository of blind faith, *The Humanist*, without further enquiry or thought.

God has been pleased to reveal Himself to His creatures in *Nature* (i.e. science), in an infallible *Book* (i.e. the Bible), and finally, utterly and completely in, and by and through, the Person and work of His Son, Jesus Christ.

The more man is aware of the breathtaking complexity and magnificence of the works of God, the more he studies the word of God, and the more he is aware of the incredible and incomprehensible love of God exhibited towards us in the giving up and sacrifice of His Son, he should be increasingly aware of the reality, the permanence and the eternal verities of this threefold Revelation. It could be, of course, that Mr. Kimbal Johnson, like some others even in this 21st century, are still ensnared

by some of the outdated and outmoded notions of false scientism, particularly the absurd and discredited 19th century theory of evolution. Fortunately, the weird ideas of Darwin, like those Marx and Freud, cannot be seriously entertained, except of course by those who have abandoned credulity and rely on blind faith.

G.M. HUBBARD
Peacehaven, Sussex

SIR: How unfortunate to be born a ruddy duck! The Government, mark you, has ordered a massive cull to exterminate this bird from these islands – thousands of them!

Is the duck criminal? Is it destructive? Does it carry TB, AIDS or some other dangerous disease? Apparently not. Its crime is that it is thriving and doing very well and interbreeding with native species so that the latter are in danger of extinction.

A spokesman has said that the ruddy duck is not European and therefore has no place here, being a genetic danger to our own native stock!

Perhaps I'm missing the point but aren't there double standards here somewhere? Haven't we always been told that to worry about the survival of our native species is 'racism'?

A.N. FLICK
Hayes, Middlesex

SIR: During my days in the regular army I was stationed out in the Far East. For a time I slept in a tent. Black ants had a hole in the ground there, where they had their nest. At the other end were red ants.

In a fit of boredom one day, I decided to see how the black and red ants got along with each other. I picked up a red ant and deposited it in black ant territory. The black ants went absolutely berserk. They swarmed around the red ant, which was bigger than they were.

The red ant backed into a sort of cave in the concrete, leaving only his powerful mandibles sticking out, and began to fight for his life. His powerful jaws could nip a black ant in half with one bite. Still, the black ants attacked, really brave little fellows, grasping onto his weapons with their weapons. They were dragging him out by sheer weight of numbers, and would inevitably have won the battle. However, I ended it by picking up the red ant and taking him back to the safety of his own territory (sighs of relief from red ant, I'll bet!).

The whole incident taught me a lesson. Black ants and red ants may all be ants; but they feel an immense antipathy for each other, and will even kill each other. What is more, they possess a very strong sense of territory. Not for them the bleeding-heart liberal view of 'co-existence'. All alien transgressors will be driven out of their territory, or killed if they persist in remaining.

Why can't our politicians go to the ants for a lesson in race relations?

HARRY MULLIN
Glasgow

London rally best for years!

EAST LONDON saw one of its best BNP meetings for many years on the 9th March, when an audience of 120 gathered above a pub in Newham to hear speeches aimed at generating support for the party's campaign to contest the London mayoral election and the elections to the Greater London Authority in 2004. Newham was an especially appropriate location, for the party owes a lot to the local branch. It was Newham BNP, then under the leadership of Ken Francis, which led the way in finding candidates for the elections to the European Parliament in 1999, and without its efforts the party would not have stood enough in England to qualify for TV time.

With John Morse chairing the meeting, London & Essex Organiser and prospective mayoral candidate Chris Roberts was the first speaker. He gave a report of recent local activities and laid great stress on the importance of next year's contests for the BNP. The mayoral campaign, he said, would cost a great deal of money – £25,000 for the deposit alone – and a start towards this must be made through the meeting collection.

CRIME IN THE CAPITAL

Former National Organiser Richard Edmonds spoke next. He dwelt on the familiar theme of the desperate degeneration of the nation's capital into a sink of violent crime and anarchy, with shoot-outs between mainly alien drug gangs a regular occurrence. For this, Londoners had to thank Labour politicians, who dominated most of the borough councils, and of course Mayor Ken Livingstone, who, though now an independent, came out of the same stable. But, said Mr. Edmonds, Londoners, like people everywhere else, were now getting sick of Labour, and the potential support for the BNP in the capital was absolutely enormous.

The final speech was made by *Spearhead* editor and BNP founder John Tyndall. Mr. Tyndall first paid tribute to the newly elected BNP councillors and their active helpers who had achieved the recent great victories in the North of England. As a former Londoner, he said, he did not want to see the capital left behind. A matter of pride should rule that London activists strive to equal these achievements. He spoke of the need for all those working towards next year's



Richard Edmonds makes a point that appears to have caused some amusement




A view from amid the audience. Chris Roberts is speaking.

elections to have a unity of aim and of spirit and to work as a harmonious team. This meant that there must be a clear-cut understanding of what they were fighting for. Apart from any other policy objectives, he said, this must involve a belief in the ideal of an eventual all-white London – no matter how hard the fight, no matter how long it may take.

The meeting ended in tremendous enthusiasm, and the collection raised a really splendid £1,024.00.

Special thanks are due to local activists who put in a lot of work to promote, plan and organise the meeting in a difficult area. A red presence was expected on the day, but on this occasion the red rabble stayed away. Everyone had a good laugh when some people arriving were snapped by a police photographer – as if the BNP were the likely law-breakers in the event of trouble rather than – as is habitual – their political opponents!



SNAPPING THE 'SUBVERSIVES'!

This police photographer was present to take pictures of the main attendees at the meeting – just a ridiculous piece of attempted intimidation of patriots by the Blair régime.

Read *Spearhead* on the Internet!

The best articles and news items published in *Spearhead* in recent months can now be seen on the *Spearhead* website. You can visit this site at:-

www.spearhead-uk.com


Edmonds speaks in Halifax

HALIFAX, in West Yorkshire, was the scene of the British National Party's latest triumph: the election of Adrian Marsden to Calderdale Council in January, the fifth such success in less than twelve months and all in the North of England.

Halifax branch of the BNP held a meeting on Thursday, the 13th March, to celebrate this victory and to prepare for the coming local government elections this Spring. More than eighty members and supporters gathered to hear Branch Organiser Richard Mulhall outline the branch's plans and goals: "If we don't stand in this election," he declared, it will be a missed opportunity." He went on to say: "The press may unfairly slate us, but that will have no effect on the electorate."

The next speaker was a former local Conservative councillor, who made a very supportive speech. He also gave some much appreciated practical advice on the 'hows' of being a councillor; and from his own experience he was able to describe the Tories as 'insipid'. He then warned that the LibDems were even more vicious than Labour.

The Branch Organiser then called upon the prospective candidates to step forward



Richard Edmonds refers to a newspaper report on London crime.

and be identified, which they did to warm and prolonged applause.

The final speaker was Richard Edmonds, from London. He spoke on his familiar theme of crime and the threat of terrorism in the capital, and he ended by wishing the local candidates all success in the coming local government contest.

The collection raised over £400, with one donor particularly generous. This will go towards the coming local government elections.

A REMINDER to those readers kind enough to send us press cuttings. Please ensure that:-

- (1) The cuttings are up to date; old news is of no value.
- (2) The items intended to be brought to our attention are clearly marked.
- (3) Items with photos that

More about cuttings

might be used should be sent in flat packages with no creases in the photo area.

Also, everyone can save themselves trouble by remembering that we will have already read items from:-

The Daily Mail, The Mail on Sunday, The Sunday Telegraph, The Sunday Times, The Daily Telegraph (Fridays only), The Sun (Tuesdays and Thursdays only), The Spectator magazine. These publications are regular reading matter and cuttings from them will be duplicated.

ROCHDALE RELAUNCH

WEDNESDAY, the 5th March, saw the relaunch of the Rochdale group of the British National Party. 18 people were in attendance – not a large number but encouraging in an area which has seen no organised party activity for some time.

The meeting was opened with a speech by the former Newark-on-Trent Organiser Kevin Bryan. Kevin spoke about how important it was for Rochdale to have its own active unit, and the night was all about putting Rochdale BNP on the map along with the other North Western towns.


Kevin then introduced Oldham Organiser Mick Treacy, who said that he looked forward to Rochdale operating as a unit in its own right as it would give him more time to concentrate on Oldham and the forthcoming elections. There was then a short break followed by a collection, which raised £95.

The Eleventh Hour

The Eleventh Hour has been described as the 'Bible' of the British National Party. First published in 1988, the latest (1998) edition has been updated to take in the many new developments on the political scene occurring since. Written by the founder of the British National Party, John Tyndall, the book gives comprehensive coverage of all the major current issues affecting Britain. It delves into the ideologies of liberalism, conservatism and the left, and also examines that of British Nationalism and its background. It contains extensive analyses of the British economy and political system. It looks at issues connected with freedom and order, the mass media, the environment, race and immigration, Northern Ireland, the Commonwealth, foreign policy and defence. It also gives a detailed outline of the development of the BNP and its predecessor organisations in Britain.

The Eleventh Hour runs to 537 pages. It is partly autobiographical, giving an account of the author's origins, early political awakening and subsequent life's work.

Price: Hardback £25.00 plus £4.35 p&p; softback £17.50 plus £3.49 p&p. Please make out cheques to Albion Press and send to PO Box 2471, Hove, E. Sussex BN3 4DT.



The book you must read if you want to find out what John Tyndall and the BNP stand for

How to obtain Spearhead

Make sure of your regular copy of *Spearhead* by becoming a subscriber. Please fill in the form here and send it to us, together with payment, as directed. Please note also the rates for bulk-buyers.

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

ENCLOSED SUBSCRIPTION OF.....

PLUS DONATION (IF ANY) OF.....

The following rates are for 12 issues (please tick box where applicable):-

British Isles £24.00 ☐; Overseas surface mail £26.50 ☐; Air mail Europe £28.50 ☐; Air mail elsewhere £35.00 ☐.

PLEASE NOTE: These overseas rates apply if remittance is in Pounds Sterling. If remittance is in any other currency, an additional charge of £4.50 is required in the case of cheques and money orders and £2.50 in the case of banknotes, these paying for banker's commission and charges.

Discounts for bulk purchases can be obtained as follows:-

10-19 copies £1.10 each; 20-49 copies £1.00 each; 50-99 copies 83p each; 100-199 copies 69p each; 200-499 copies 60p each; 500 copies 55p each. For advice on postal rates for these quantities please contact our office.

All cheques and postal or money orders should be made out to *Spearhead* and sent to PO Box 2471, Hove, E. Sussex BN3 4DT. Please do not include payment for *Spearhead* in a remittance which includes payment for other items.

RICHARD EDMONDS AT MANCHESTER

THE recently formed North Manchester branch of the British National Party held a very successful meeting on Wednesday, the 19th February. More than a hundred members, supporters and guests attended the best event organised so far by this fast-growing unit.

Branch organiser Gary King opened the proceedings and outlined the BNP's ambitions in this Spring's local government elections. Warm applause greeted his assertion of confidence in the outcome of the campaign. He then called for more leafleters and canvassers. He finished his report by calling for a round of applause for a local member, sitting in the audience, who had just recruited *fifteen* fellow-workers at his workplace to the BNP.

The final speaker was the guest of the evening, Richard Edmonds. In his speech he described the appalling and dangerous situation in London resulting from immigration and rising crime. For example, the murder rate in the capital had now reached one a day; and in London the scale of the asylum-seeker problem had reached such levels that the chiefs of the Government's security and intelligence services have been quoted in national newspapers as saying that the numbers are so great that they fear a real security threat. "You don't need many," one said, "to set up terrorist cells."

Mr. Edmonds drew the obvious conclusion that on crime, immigration and terrorism the politicians of the establishment parties had completely lost control. As a result of the clear dereliction of their duty towards the British people these politicians were rapidly losing all credibility with the electorate. This explained our recent successes in the North of England. And this rejection of Lab, Lib and Con could also be clearly seen in the recent election in Stoke-on-Trent, where the BNP candidate obtained a very good vote and where the combined votes of Labour, the Tories and Liberal Democrats came to just eight per cent of the electorate. The loss of credibility of these parties is startling, timely and most welcome, he said.

The meeting was most ably chaired by the leader of the BNP youth wing Tony Wentworth.



Manchester: Richard Edmonds speaks

Blotted out of the news!

Below is a report of the same Manchester meeting as that reported on this page. It appeared in the March issue of the official BNP paper The Voice of Freedom. Two of the speakers are mentioned – quite rightly – but the main speaker at the meeting, Richard Edmonds, receives no mention at all! Rather like the out-of-favour people who were erased from photos in Stalin's Russia. This kind of pettiness is almost unbelievable.

Big meeting in Manchester

THE February meeting of the Manchester BNP was well attended with over 100 people present including many new members.

The meeting was chaired by the chairman of the Young BNP, Tony Wentworth, who introduced North Manchester organiser, Gary King, to those present.

Gary reported on the results of the latest census which showed a 3% increase in the ethnic population in just 10 years.

"Those figures don't include the many hundreds of thousands of so-called asylum seekers, refugees and illegal immigrants that have arrived on our shores during this time," he told the audience.

SPEARHEAD SUPPORT FUND

Income from the sales of our magazine is not enough to cover full production and administrative costs. We therefore rely on regular donations from our supporters so that we may remain solvent.

Also, because of the controversial nature of the opinions expressed in these columns, it is impossible to induce wholesale distributors to handle the magazine. Hence our need for additional financial support.

Please send all contributions to *Spearhead*, PO Box 2471, Hove, East Sussex BN3 4DT. Please note that receipts are not normally sent for donations of less than £10 unless specifically requested – in which case an SAE would be much appreciated. Thanks.

Listen to nationalist radio!

Send International Reply Coupon for broadcast details to:-

NATIONAL VANGUARD BOOKS, Box 330, Hillsboro, WV 24946, U.S.A.

Internet: www.natvan.com & www.natall.com

TYNDALL IN ESSEX

Excellent Basildon meeting fires up council election campaign

BASILDON (Essex) was the scene of a really excellent BNP meeting held on the 15th March in support of local candidates in the coming council elections on the 1st May. About 60 were in attendance – which made the meeting by far the biggest and best the party had ever held in the outer regions of the county.

A varied panel of speakers took the platform with Organiser Chris Roberts in the chair. The first was a relative newcomer, Peter Eaton, who was not able to qualify to stand as a candidate this time but hopes to do so in the future. The main point of his speech was to say that almost every change in the country that he had seen in his lifetime had been a change for the worse. This was why a party like the BNP was essential to reverse the decline.

Basildon organiser Matthew Single spoke next, stressing that there was absolutely no alternative to the BNP if Britain were not to sink without a trace.

Graham John, another local election candidate, spoke forcefully about the debt that British Nationalists of today owe to the pioneer work of predecessors, some of whom are no longer with us. He mentioned Albert Marriner, a particularly dedicated fighter, who died back in the 1980s as a result of an injury inflicted in an attack by political opponents. Others remembered were Blaise Wyndham, Dave Bruce and John Fawcus, whose son Rick today carries on the family tradition of activism.

A surprise speaker was former Young

JOHN TYNDALL SPEAKS
Seated left to right are: Mark Coillett, Matthew Single, Chris Roberts and Graham John



BNP leader Mark Collett, who had come down from Leeds for the weekend and was warmly welcomed by the audience. He spoke of the appalling conditions that had been allowed to fester in Leeds and Bradford, where he was mostly active. These conditions were mainly the consequence of successive governments' policies of uncontrolled immigration and enforced multi-racialism.

After an interval for drinks, another council candidate, Julian Leppart, spoke. He related how, when his candidature was announced, he received a letter from his local Commission for Racial Equality (CRE) demanding to know what he would do for 'racial harmony' if elected. He said that he had replied that his main objective would be to fight against bodies like the CRE and undo the mischief they had done. This brought loud cheers.

John Tyndall made the final speech. He began by addressing newcomers, saying that when coming to their first BNP meeting they may wonder "what sort of people we are." For a start, he said, we're very different from conventional politicians in that we don't tell lies. Next, none of us is in politics for personal gain, for politics for politics' sake. In any other time and place most of us would prefer to be doing something different, but we're in this because we want to reverse the decline of our country – which has been going on without remit for over 50 years.

For a long time, he went on, we have been met with apathy and indifference, but now, with the effects of treasonable policies being felt by many millions, the people are starting to listen to us. Mr. Tyndall slammed

what he called "Tony's war," saying that Iraq is not worth a drop of blood from a single British soldier. Britons, he said, should only be sent to fight when Britain's security or vital interests are at stake.

At the end of his speech, Mr. Tyndall evoked the memory of our real national military heroes over the ages, who so often have been betrayed by their political leaders. They, he said, now call out to us in the BNP "to give them the victory for which they died."

The collection raised over £500.



THE LOCAL ORGANISER
Matthew Single speaks



GRAHAM JOHN SPEAKS
He remembered old comrades